DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 089 440 24 EA 006 027

AUTHOR	Charters, W. W., Jr.; And Others
TITLE	Perspectives on Educational Administration and the Behavioral Sciences.
INSTITUTION	Oregon Univ., Eugene.
SPONS AGENCY	National Center for Educational Research and Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO	BR-5-0217-2
PUB DATE	Jun 65
CONTRACT	OEC-4-10-163
NOTE	116p.; Re-announcement of ED 011 568
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$5.40 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Cultural Factors; Decision Making; *Educational Administration; *Educational Sociology; *Evaluation; Political Issues; *Research Problems; *Social Psychology
IDENTIFIERS	Eugene; Oceanlake Conference

ABSTRACT

The papers in this publication were presented at a 3-day staff conference of the Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration (CASEA). The objectives of the conference were to (1) assess the actual and potential contributions of various academic disciplines to the program area of the Center, (2) evaluate the field of administration as an area of academic interest, (3) discuss existing deficiencies in research and practice, and (4) examine the relationships of educational institutions to the larger social and cultural environments in which they are embedded. The seven papers that contributed to the achievement of these objectives presented the following topics -- (1) the emerging science of administration as revealed by the literature in a variety of academic disciplines, (2) an analysis of the deficiencies of current research in educational administration and the correctives needed to produce research of high quality, (3) educational administration as viewed from the perspective of the sociology of education, (4) means to develop a social psychology of educational administration, (5) the use of analytical techniques employed in economics to make decisionmaking in education more rational and systematic, (6) cultural factors in the educational process, and (7) the schools as transmission agents for political values. (AL)

ED 089440

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Perspectives on Educational Administration and the Behavioral Sciences

W. W. CHARTERS, JR.
BURTON R. CLARK
JACK A. CULBERTSON
DANIEL E. GRIFFITHS
WERNER Z. HIRSCH
DOROTHY LEE
NICHOLAS A. MASTERS

A publication of
THE CENTER FOR THE ADVANCED STUDY OF
EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
Eugene, Oregon

EA 006 027

First Printing, June, 1965
Second Printing, December, 1965
Third Printing, June, 1966
Fourth Printing, July, 1968

Printed in the United States of America
at the University of Oregon Press, Eugene, Oregon

Designed and edited by Joanne M. Kitchel

The text of this book is set in Janson type
on Simpson's eggshell text

Library of Congress Catalog Number 65-63431

Perspectives on Educational Administration and the Behavioral Sciences

The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration at the University of Oregon is a national research and development center which was established under the provisions of the Cooperative Research Program of the United States Office of Education. The research and development reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Division of Educational Laboratories of the Office of Education. No federal funds were used in the publication of this report.

Foreword

The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration was established at the University of Oregon in April, 1964, by contractual agreement with the Research and Development Center Program of the United States Office of Education. While the Center began operations during the spring and summer of 1964, it was not until September that a sizeable professional staff representing a variety of academic disciplines could be assembled. During a period of three days (September 16-18) a staff conference was held at Oceanlake, Oregon. The papers in this volume were presented at that conference.

The Center program deals with the social context of school organization and educational administration. It is concerned with public educational organizations at all levels; its activities include basic and applied research as well as developmental and dissemination programs. A distinctive feature of the Center is that its work is based largely upon the behavioral sciences.

The staff assembled at the Oceanlake Conference represented a variety of academic disciplines, interests, and skills. Furthermore, the members of the staff differed considerably in their previous experience in matters relevant to the program of the Center. It therefore seemed appropriate that the objectives of the conference should be to assess the actual and potential contributions of various academic disciplines to the program area of the Center, to evaluate the field of administration as an area of academic interest, to discuss existing deficiencies in research and practice, and to examine the relationships of educational institutions to the larger socal and cultural environments in which they are embedded.

The papers in this volume contribute to the achievement of these objectives in different ways. In the first presentation, Jack A. Culbertson discusses the emerging science of administration as revealed by the literature in a variety of academic disciplines. His paper examines landmarks in the development of an administrative science, trends and issues in the study of administration, and possible strategies for improving the state of knowledge. In the second paper, Daniel E. Griffiths focuses his attention on the field of educational administration. In examining the state of theory and research, he brings up to date his well known earlier contribution, *Research in Educational Ad-*

ministration: An Appraisal and a Plan (New York: Teachers College Bureau of Publications, 1959). His paper provides an effective analysis of the deficiencies of current research and the correctives needed in order to produce research of high quality.

The remaining papers in the volume, all by behavioral scientists, provide additional perspectives and diverse substantive content. Burton R. Clark looks at educational administration from the perspective of the sociology of education. He gives examples of ways in which sociological analysis provides insight into problems of administering educational institutions, especially at the college level. He also shows how topics of concern to the field of sociology can be profitably studied in educational settings. W. W. Charters, Jr. focuses his attention on how a social psychology of educational administration might be developed. He summarizes a number of the few relevant studies done in social psychology, and indicates some potential contributions that various social psychological approaches can make to the study of educational administration. A different kind of contribution is made by Werner Z. Hirsch in his paper. Instead of examining the contributions of the field of economics to educational administration, he shows how analytical techniques employed in economics can be used to make decision-making in education more rational and systematic. Program budgeting and benefit-cost analysis are the "tools" he discusses.

The final two papers deal with education in relation to the larger social and cultural contexts in which education occurs. Dorothy Lee's discussion of cultural factors in the educational process calls attention to the fact that education (as well as socialization in general) is closely intertwined with the values and motivations that are of central importance in a given time and place. By analyzing education in two cultures quite different from our own, she leads us to question some common assumptions about the process of education. Nicholas A. Masters, in the final paper, deals with education as a political activity and with schools as transmission agents for political values. Educational institutions, he tells us, both reflect societal (including political) conditions and play a fundamental role in perpetuating them.

A substantial number of staff members of the Center made important contributions to the Oceanlake Conference. Some presented papers not reproduced in this volume. Others took primary responsibilities for the many details of a managerial nature that must be handled effectively in a conference of this kind. To our own staff, therefore, as well as to the authors of the papers in this volume, we are indebted for an interesting and enlightening conference.

ROLAND J. PELLEGRIN
Director
CENTER FOR THE ADVANCED STUDY
OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

May, 1965
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, Eugene, Oregon

Contents

Foreword v

1
Trends and Issues in the Development of a Science of Administration JACK A. CULBERTSON 3

2
Research and Theory in Educational Administration DANIEL E. GRIFFITHS 25

3
The Sociology of Educational Administration BURTON R. CLARK 51

4
The Social Psychology of Educational Administration W. W. CHARTERS, JR. 71

5
Decision Tools for Education WERNER Z. HIRSCH 83

6
Cultural Factors in the Educational Process DOROTHY LEE 97

7
The Politics of Public Education NICHOLAS A. MASTERS 111

1

Trends and Issues in the Development of a Science of Administration

By
JACK A. CULBERTSON

Trends and Issues in the Development of A Science of Administration

JACK A. CULBERTSON
UNIVERSITY COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

ISSUES ASSOCIATED with what we (perhaps pretentiously) call a science of administration are neither simple in character nor few in number. The fact that they have not yielded to easy resolution even when the most distinguished thinkers have grappled with them is evidence of their complexity. Their abundance is also understandable when one realizes that both science and administration are so deeply and pervasively imbedded in our culture that they impinge upon most facets of societal life.

TRENDS IN THE DEVELOPING "SCIENCE" OF ADMINISTRATION

Before discussing selected issues I would like to delineate briefly some of the more conspicuous trends associated with the developing "science" of administration. In identifying events which illustrate the various trends, I, for obvious reasons, will not be able to be comprehensive. Another limiting condition is that the analysis will focus largely upon the last two decades. An assumption underlying the discussion is that a science of administration consists of (1) a body of knowledge about the making and implementing of decisions by those who have responsibility for a total organization or for an important division, program, or function within it and (2) modes of inquiry which can add to this body of knowledge.

Trend One: During the last fifteen years it has become fashionable among many students of administration to distinguish clearly and sharply between statements describing administrative behavior and those prescribing administrative behavior; the goal has become more that of explanation and less that of exhortation.

Most scholars would likely agree that the publication of Herbert Simon's book on administrative behavior in 1945 constituted an important landmark on the road to a hoped for "science of administration."[1] Of pertinence to the discussion here is the well-known fact that Simon's thinking was clearly influenced by the logical positivists, a group of thinkers who earlier had made a sharp distinction between questions of fact and questions of value. Questions of fact, they emphasized, were in the realm of science. Questions of value, on the other hand, had to do with matters of preference, purposes and ideals; answers to these questions could not be verified by the scientific method.

This distinction between questions of fact and questions of value became the starting point for Simon's theories. For him it was basic to the "nature of administrative science."[2] Unquestionably, this thinking helped re-orient intellectual activity among students of administration. A major textbook on public administration in 1950, for example, concentrated upon describing and explaining administration and consciously avoided prescribing what government administrators *should* do.[3] In educational administration the first substantial impact of the "fact" and "value" distinction in publication form is found in Coladarci and Getzel's *The Use of Theory in Educational Administration* made available in 1955.[4]

Those who chose to pursue the goal of explanation through scientific study turned their backs on a tradition that was strongly value oriented. Textbooks and articles in this tradition were filled with countless principles of administration which inevitably contained the word "should." The titles and texts of these publications were usually replete with value-infused terms such as "democracy" and "human dignity." By delineating more clearly the boundaries of a projected administrative science it is evident, then, that Simon helped to set a new goal for students of adminstration, a goal that was focused in its target, limited in its scope and one that broke sharply with tradition.

Trend Two: In recent decades there has been a distinct shift among scholars from an economic perspective of administration and organization to one which concentrates more upon the psycho-sociological aspects of these phenomena.

The pioneering work of Frederick Taylor and his efforts to pave the way to a science of management during the first quarter of this century are well-known. Of significance here is the fact that his concentration upon efficient organization for job performance was central to the economic view of administration and organization. However, it is worth noting that his view was limited in the sense that he concentrated largely upon the production process with the goal of making the worker, who seemed to him to be an inefficient instrument, more efficient in task performance. Other scholars were to use the economic perspective to analyze organization in a more encompassing sense and to view administration from the top level downward. Systematic thought of the latter type was set forth in the important book *Papers on the Science of Administration* published in 1937.[5] In the book are found such concepts as "division of work," "span of control," "technical efficiency," "work units," "line and staff," "the scalar process," "coordination" and so forth. These terms suggest something of the economic view of administration.

---

[1] Herbert Simon, *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organization*. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1947.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 45 ff.

[3] Herbert Simon, Donald Smithberg and Victor Thompson, *Public Administration*. New York: Alfred Knopf, Inc., 1950.

[4] Arthur P. Coladarci and Jacob W. Getzels, *The Use of Theory in Educational Administration*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1955.

During the last two decades the psycho-sociological view of organization became more predominant. The use of terms such as those just noted faded into the background and others such as "informal organization," "communication," "organizational behavior," "perception," "decision-making," "human factors," "motivation," "conflict," "social process" and "organizational loyalty" came into the foreground. The implicit assumptions in the economic perspective that organized activity can be a highly rational affair gave way to a perspective which, among other things, highlighted the non-rational aspects of organizational life.

It should be made clear that the shift in perspective was not as sudden or as sharp as portrayed here. For example, the volume *Papers on the Science of Administration* contained one chapter called "The Effects of the Social Environment"[6] which seemed markedly out of place. This chapter, as the title suggests, foreshadowed the new orientation. Chester Barnard's book, *Functions of the Executive*, published in 1938, was also ahead of its time in the sense that it sought and achieved a remarkable synthesis of economic and psycho-sociological views of organization and administration.[7]

Trend Three: The view that administrative processes are similar even though they take place in diverse organizations has been widely accepted.

---

[5] Luther Gulick and L. Urwick (eds.), *Papers on the Science of Administration*. New York: Institute of Public Administration, 1937.

[6] J. Henderson, "The Effects of the Social Environment," in Luther Gulick and L. Urwick (eds.), *Papers on the Science of Administration*. New York: Institute of Public Administration, 1937.

[7] Chester Barnard, *Functions of the Executive*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1938.

Previous to the 1950's there had been a notable insularity among scholars studying administration and organization. However, events of the fifties helped break down this insularity. As scholars discovered common interests and developed broader perspectives, aspirations for more general theories of administrations developed. It is significant, for example, that the first article in the initial issue of the *Administrative Science Quarterly*, published in 1956 and written by Edward Litchfield, who was then Dean of the Graduate School of Business and Public Administration at Cornell, pointed to the need for a general theory of administration. Entitled "Notes on a General Theory of Administration," the article maintained that:

> The most serious indictment which must be made of present thought is that it has failed to achieve a level of generalization enabling it to systemize and explain administrative phenomena which occur in related fields.[8]

The *Administrative Science Quarterly* undoubtedly deserves considerable credit for promoting an interest in the concept of administration *qua* administration. Its four initial issues, for example, contained articles about administration in such diverse organizations as research corporations, British and American ships, manufacturer dealers systems, Soviet business operations and hospitals. In addition, there were articles such as the one by Talcott Parsons on "Suggestions for a Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organizations," which sought to develop theories applicable to diverse organizations.

Most of the concepts which had significance for administration in different fields had their roots in social science disciplines. Illustrations of such concepts are found in a passage introducing the second edition of Simon's book on administrative behavior in 1957 in which he noted:

> I suppose that I might claim some kind of prophetic gift in having incorporated in the title and sub-title (of the book) three of the most currently fashionable words in social science—"behavior," "decision-making," and "organization."[9]

Such concepts tended to highlight aspects of organizational life common to different fields of administration. As they were used by students of administration in various fields, the view that administration in diverse organizations is characterized by a pervasive uniqueness changed. Thus, John Walton, a professor of educational administration at Johns Hopkins University, in a book *Administration and Policy Making* published in 1959, maintained that:

---

[8] Edward Litchfield, "Notes on a General Theory of Administration," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 1, 1956, p. 7.

[9] Herbert Simon, *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organization*. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1957, Second Edition.

> Administration is basically the same in all organizations whether they be educational, industrial, governmental, military, or ecclesiastical.[10]

In more recent years organized efforts to delineate the aspects of administration common to different organizations have led to some distinctions between what is common and what is unique.[11] It is now recognized that differences in organizational purposes, contexts, and technologies undoubtedly affect the weighting and interrelationships of variables in administrative processes. In addition, there may be special variables such as those associated with professionalization which make decision-making substantially different in universities, for example, as contrasted with decision-making in certain business organizations. However, the view that administration is fundamentally similar in different organizations is still widespread.

Trend Four: The view that basic knowledge of administration can be advanced through empirical study involving the testing and developing of theory has gained increasing credence among students of administration.

When the *Administrative Science Quarterly* was initiated in 1956 by the Graduate School of Business and Public Administration at Cornell University, its editor, James Thompson, introduced the periodical as follows:

> When we look back in 1966, it may be obvious that administration was at a prescience stage in 1956. Yet if the name of this journal proves to have been premature, it was not lightly chosen. It expresses a possibility of developing an administration science and a conviction that progress is being made and will continue.[12]

The enhanced commitment by students of administration to systematic research found two major expressions: first, in the development and use of theory, and second, in the borrowing and adapting of research techniques and instruments from the behavioral sciences.

Perhaps in no field were there such organized efforts to develop and to adapt theory as in educational administration. Paul Cullinan has observed that two different approaches to theory development were used. The first he describes as follows.

> In the first approach the production of concepts was largely through some form of inductive reasoning that stemmed from intuition and empirical

---

[10] John Walton, *Administration and Policy Making*. Baltimore, Maryland: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1959, p. 35.

[11] Donald Leu and Herbert Rudman (eds.), *Preparation Programs for School Administrators: Common and Specialized Learnings*. East Lansing, Michigan: College of Education, Michigan State University, 1963. Also see Van Miller, *Common and Specialized Learnings for Educational Administrators*. The University Council for Educational Administration, 1964.

[12] James Thompson, "Editorial," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 1, p. 1.

> Patterns, the Man-Job-Setting approaches are examples of practice-oriented findings about the phenomena studied . . . The "task areas," the Competency conceptualizations.[13]

Several practice-oriented conceptualizations came initially from the W. K. Kellogg-supported Cooperative Programs in Educational Administration (CPEA). The "Man-Job-Setting" conceptualization, for example, grew out of the Middle Atlantic CPEA Center located at Teachers College, Columbia University, while the "Competency Pattern" formulation was developed in the Southern States CPEA Program headquarters at George Peabody College.[14] These conceptualizations and others similar to them were judged by many as highly primitive approaches to theory development. However, in spite of their limitations, they generated considerable research, created an interest in concept development, and undoubtedly helped pave the way to the second approach to theory development described by Cullinan as follows:

> Another way of addressing phenomena was through the orderly pursuit of knowledge from theoretical formulations. A large proportion of theorizing in educational administration was based on theories borrowed or adapted from other areas.[15]

The papers presented at the first UCEA Career Seminar held at the University of Chicago in 1957 provide a good illustration of this second approach.[16] Among these papers are various theories of administration most of which are borrowed from basic disciplines and adapted to the study of administration: Getzel's formulation of "social process"; Hemphill's concepts of 'problem-solving"; Parson's theory of "formal organizations"; Griffith's conceptualization of "decision-making"; and Shartle's framework of "behavior in organizations."

As concepts were generated and as theories were borrowed and applied for the first time to the study of educational administration, new research techniques and instruments designed to produce more precise measures of the variables under study were also employed. Thus, sociometric methods were used to study informal organization;

---

[13] Paul Cullinan, *A Taxonomic Mode of Inquiry and Its Application to Educational Administration*. An Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1964, p. 2.

[14] For these and related examples see the following:

Roald Campbell and Russell Gregg, (eds.), *Administrative Behavior in Education*. New York: Harper and Bros., 1957.

[15] Paul Cullinan, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

[16] Andrew Halpin, *Administrative Theory in Education*. Chicago, Illinois: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1958. For other illustrations see:

Jack Culbertson and Stephen Hencley (eds.), *Educational Research: New Perspectives*. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1963.

Daniel Griffiths (ed.), *Behavioral Sciences and Educational Administration*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

forced-choice instruments and the Q-sort technique to study role expectations; participant observation to study cooptation; rumor analysis to study communication; the F scale and the Rorschach Test to study the personalities of principals; the reputational technique to study power structure; simulation to study decision-making; and so forth.

Trend Five: Scholars from such disciplines as psychology, sociology, political science, anthropology and economics increasingly have participated in the study of administration.

When the economic view of administration gave way to the psycho-sociological view, the door to the study of administration was opened wider for social scientists than ever before. In educational administration the W. K. Kellogg-supported CPEA centers were important mechanisms for encouraging sociologists, psychologists and others to enter schools and school districts and to study administration.[17] Ford Foundation-supported programs stimulated many social scientists to investigate dimensions of organizational behavior in business organizations. Related programs enabled social scientists to study administration in a range of organizations. The result of these various programs was to increase substantially the number of social scientists studying administration.

The point can be illustrated more specifically from a study by Kenneth Boulding, who in 1958 analyzed the relationship between disciplinary background and output of the various authors whose articles had appeared in the first two volumes of *Administrative Science Quarterly*.[18] Substantially more articles were authored by sociologists, economists, political scientists, and social psychologists than by professors of business, hospital, public, educational and related fields of administration. Out of 823 pages in the first two volumes, 427 or almost half, were contributed by sociologists. Political scientists were next with 59 pages, and they were followed by economists, social psychologists, and social anthropologists with 48 pages, 37 pages, and 15 pages, respectively. Professors of business administration contributed 128 pages, and professors of public administration contributed 79 pages. It is significant that professors of educational administration, although contributing reviews, did not contribute to the first two volumes. They have published a number of articles in succeeding volumes.

While sociologists and psychologists had greater involvement initially in the study of educational administration, particularly in the W.

---

[17] Hollis Moore, *Studies in School Administration*. 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1957.

[18] Kenneth E. Boulding, "Evidences for an Administrative Science: A Review of the Administrative Science Quarterly, Volumes 1 and 2," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 3, 1958, pp. 1-22.

K. Kellogg-supported CPEA centers, it is notable that political scientists and economists in the last five years have become increasingly interested in the field. The recently published book called, *The Politics of Education in the Local Community* provides evidence of this interest on the part of political scientists.[19] *Public School Finance: Economics and Politics*, by the economist, Jesse Burkhead, published earlier this year, provides evidence that both political scientists and economists are involved in the study of educational administration.[20]

As various scholars have turned to the study of administration, new institutional arrangements have been created to facilitate their efforts. Following his appointment as Chancellor at the University of Pittsburgh, for example, Edward Litchfield soon established an Administrative Science Center, staffed by scholars trained in such disciplines as sociology and in such applied fields as educational administration. Its chief mission was not so much to teach as to develop knowledge.[21] This represented a new arrangement for the study of administration *qua* administration.

One of the most dramatic new arrangements for advancing the study of administration is the newly established Research and Development Center at the University of Oregon which will use multidisciplinary resources to study administration in the years ahead. This is indeed a development of unusual significance. Many persons will be interested in its problems and its achievements as we continue to strive for a better understanding of administration.

THE STUDY OF ADMINISTRATION: SOME SALIENT ISSUES.

The trends described above have not developed without controversy. Issues which were recognized even before the trends developed have become more prominent, and many new ones have been brought to the surface. Consequently, there are dozens of issues facing those who would advance the study of administration. A few of those, which seem particularly important at this stage in the study of administration, will now be treated.

Issue One: Is it better to concentrate upon developing a science or discipline of administration rather than upon using existing sciences and disciplines to advance the study of administration?

In recent decades various events have given encouragement to those who would build *a* science of administration. Periodicals such as the *Journal of the Academy of Management* and the *Administrative Science Quarterly*, for example, are symbols of the growth and acceptance of the study of administration. Organizations such as The Society for the Study of Public Administration and the University Council for Educational Administration, have come into being in part to stimulate and help provide outlets for scholarly efforts. Such developments have raised hopes for a new discipline with clearly defined conceptual boundaries and modes of inquiry for building a body of knowledge. In spite of such developments, however, there are formidable barriers which stand in the way of achieving standard definitions of administration, of denoting its boundaries, of operationalizing its concepts, and of performing cumulative empirical work.

---

[19] Robert Cahill and Stephen Hencley (eds.), *The Politics of Education in the Local Community*. Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1964.

[20] Jesse Burkhead, *Public School Finance: Economics and Politics*. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1964.

[21] See James Thompson *et. al.* (eds.),*Comparative Studies in Administration*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1959.

Among the barriers, for example, is the lack of substantial cadre of scholars who have career commitments to study administration. In fact, those now studying administration are representatives of different disciplines, by and large, and are being guided in their studies by diverse conceptualizations which have varying degrees of specificity. Most of those in the behavioral sciences studying aspects of administration have more basic commitments to their own disciplines than to *a* science of administration. On the other hand, those in departments of business, government, educational and related fields of administration have had to cope with increasingly large training and consultant demands, and have had difficulty in contributing to the development of *a* science of administration.

The counter-strategy of using existing sciences and disciplines to advance the study of administration can usefully be viewed in relation to the development of the study of medicine. In 1765 when John Morgan, the first professor of medicine in the United States, spoke to a commencement group at the College of Philadelphia, he argued that already established sciences such as anatomy, physiology, chemistry, and botany should be viewed as "branches of medicine."[22] Even though the ideas set forth by Morgan were not to be accepted and implemented for more than one hundred years after their expression, they provided a framework for the eventual development of medical science.

Clearly, Morgan's ideas have implications for advancing the study of administration in that the study of the structure, functions, and processes of organizational behavior is somewhat analogous to the study of the structure, functions, and processes of the body. It could be argued, in other words, that the disciplines of economics, political science, sociology, psychology, and social anthropology are branches of administration and, therefore, the best way to advance the study of administration is to concentrate upon developing and using these branches of science rather than upon developing *a* science of administration.

---

[22] John Morgan, *A Discourse Upon the Institutions of the Medical Schools in America*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1937.

Such a choice, however, must face the fact that the disciplines just noted, even though possessing a substantial body of concepts as demonstrated in the recent book of Berelson and Steiner,[23] are still in their developmental stages. Ideas developed by Joseph Schwab about the "structure" or what might be called the various sub-structures of disciplines are relevant to the problem.[24] He notes, for example, that the field of learning, which forms only a part of psychology, has at least eleven different structures. He estimates that there are 30 structures in the area of sociology and anthropology. When one adds to these the estimated numbers in economics and political science, the problem of understanding these structures and in making judgments about those most relevant to the practice of administration becomes clear. The task of applying concepts from these disciplines is vastly more complicated than in such disciplines as physics where there are two or three structures or in biology where there are five or six.

The outlines of the dilemma are now undoubtedly clear. To concentrate upon *a* science of administration is to fly in the face of formidable problems such as those associated with the lack of a clearly defined discipline and with the limited number of scholars who have career commitments to study administration. On the other hand, if efforts cannot be consciously directed and focused upon clear targets, administrative study is likely to be diffuse, desultory, and the results scattered and even hidden in a variety of specialized endeavors.

Issue Two: Is the sharp distinction between questions of fact and questions of value the most fruitful one for advancing the study and practice of administration?

As already noted, Simon's "is-ought" distinction placed a general boundary on administrative science and helped scholars understand the nature of scientific study and to engage in it more effectively. It also made them more sensitive to the logical fallacy noted by Waldo of "jumping from the observation of what *is* to the assertion of what *ought* to be true."[25] This new awareness was necessary and timely, particularly in view of the strong value orientation which was reflected in the work of many professors of administration in the late thirties and forties.

However, important developments in recent decades have helped highlight some long-range and fundamental problems facing those who would live by Simon's "is-ought" distinction. In training, for example, there has emerged an aspiration which is now widespread, to prepare and place persons in administrative posts who are outstanding leaders. Leadership, of course, is notable for its moral quality and for the fact that unlike science, it cannot be neutral; further, it is fundamentally concerned with the determination of ends and with the relationship between ends and means. Thus, the statesman must not only deal with the process of change but, in addition, the question of change for what?

---

[23] Bernard Berelson and Gary Steiner, *Human Behavior: An Inventory of Scientific Findings*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964.

[24] Joseph Schwab, "Education and Structure of the Disciplines," National Education Association, (mimeographed), 1961.

[25] Dwight Waldo, *The Study of Public Administration*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Inc., 1955, p. 43.

In the practice of educational administration there have also been important developments which bear upon the problem. Events of the past ten years, for example, have raised some of the most fundamental value questions which can confront a society. In a period of race riots, civil rights demonstrations, teacher strikes, knowledge explosion, and basic changes in the employment structure, value questions for the statesman will not go away. At such times the science of administration, in the narrower sense, is likely not to be the chief center of relevance for him. To be sure, knowledge developed by the sociologist about community power structure, for example, will be useful; however, the question of what purpose or purposes to be achieved through the power structure will remain. In deciding these questions factors must be considered which are outside the purview of science. Answers to purpose questions, in other words, cannot be validated through scientific method.

To push the issue further, could it not be maintained that departments of administration in which the professors concentrated only on scientific administration might find their efforts dysfunctional in preparing students for posts of leadership? In other words, might a concentration by administrators-to-be on an understanding of what "is" create "blinders" that would interfere with their future role as leaders?

Issue Three: Can schools and departments in universities, as traditionally organized, effectively advance the study of administration?

Most studies of administration in the past have been conducted in schools or departments of business, government, educational, hospital, and related fields of administration. In recent years, as already noted, behavioral scientists have increasingly engaged in such studies and they have done so through a variety of organizational arrangements: their own departments; as joint appointees in schools or departments of administration; as members of short-term interdisciplinary research teams; and as full-fledged appointees of departments of educational, governmental, and business administration. In addition, special training arrangements developed cooperatively by professors of business, educational, and government administration (including behavioral scientists) have in recent years led to the synthesis of the research concepts which span these various fields.[26]

The increased participation by various scholars in the study of administration, as already noted, has had positive results; however, the movement has lacked stability. Perhaps the fundamental reason for the instability is that incentive systems affecting professors' behavior have not been supportive to the movement. Promotions and professional status for social scientists have been more easily achieved from within their own discipline. The reward systems for professors of administration, on the other hand, have typically been more closely geared to field relationships, to teaching, and to administrative practice, and less to scholarly activity. Behavioral scientists under this system have had a tendency to move in and out of the study of administration. Professors of administration, on the other hand, have had difficulty in sustaining research efforts. In addition, organized research arrangements supporting interdisciplinary research have generally been dependent upon outside funds, and universities, by and large, have not supported such arrangements when these funds are spent.

Some have argued for new organizational arrangements to advance the study of administration. Ivan Hinderaker, for example, has maintained that the fields of business, government, and educational administration cannot make needed progress as currently organized. Consequently, he argues for a Graduate School of Administration which would encompass and serve all these fields of administration and perhaps related ones.[27] Although the idea is discussed largely in relation to training, it is clear that Hinderaker believes it would also help advance the study of administration.

Edward Litchfield, Chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh, has suggested that the problem can be approached through better coordination of university resources.[28] Coordination of these resources, he suggests, would be carried out in relation to three professional groupings; the health professions, the engineering professions and the social professions, including educational administration. He would have a dean for each area who in cooperation with inter-faculty committees would, among other things, help to see that the various disciplines of the university served the professional fields effectively. The biological sciences would serve the health professions, physics and mathematics the engineering professions, and the social sciences the social professions.

---

[26] Egbert Wengert (ed.), *The Study of Administration*. Eugene, Oregon: The University of Oregon, 1961.

[27] Ivan Hinderaker, "The Study of Administration: Interdisciplinary Dimensions," *The Western Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. XVI, No. 3, September, 1963, pp. 5-12.

[28] Edward Litchfield, "Organization in Large American Universities: The Faculties." *Journal of Higher Education*: Vol. 30, No. 7, October, 1959, pp. 353-364.

Issue Four: Can the current ways of recruiting scholars to study administration effectively advance scholarly activity?

As already implied, professors interested in advancing the study of administration have come from two pools of talent: one from administrative practice and subsequent doctoral training in a school or department of administration; the other from special training in a social science discipline. Both of these approaches have limitations. Elsewhere I have discussed the strengths and limitations of recruiting professors of educational administration from among the ranks of practicing administrators. The most serious limitation is in relation to the function of advancing knowledge of administration.

> Traditionally, professors of educational administration have prepared themselves as teachers, have taught in the public schools, have prepared themselves for school administration, and have served in administrative posts *before* entering the professorship. This has resulted in some advantages to departments of educational administration, particularly in regard to the teaching and development functions.... Persons with such experience have understood the problems of administrative practice, have had advantages in relating concepts to practice, and have been effective in giving help to administrators. The extensive experience they have had as teachers and administrators has also served them usefully in their relationships with students.
>
> From the standpoint of the function of producing new knowledge, however, traditional patterns of recruitment have had distinct limitations. In the first place, the protracted experience preceding the professorship prevents personnel from entering universities until they are in their late thirties and forties. For the majority of persons the creative period for scholarly activity comes at an earlier period in life. Secondly, research is typically a specialized activity while the administrator is one who deals with a variety of specializations and their interrelationships. Since the administrator becomes a generalist working with numerous specialists, extended work in administration may be antithetical to research activity in the specialized sense. Finally, it has been observed that those entering universities with previous administrative experience are much more likely to be called upon for administrative assignments within the university than are those in other areas of education. This again militates against long-term arrangements to advance research in educational administration.[29]

Graduate and undergraduate students in sociology, economics, psychology, political science, anthropology and related disciplines represent a talent pool from which potential scholars to study administration can be drawn. Not only is this a relatively large pool, but the age of the individuals is also such that they could contribute many years to the study of administration. However, in contrast to the professor of educational administration, who is recruited from school districts, these graduate and undergraduate students lack sufficient opportunities to develop interests in administration as a field of study. Since they generally lack experiences with professors who are committed to administrative study, it is difficult for them to identify with the field. In addition, it is not easy for them to obtain opportunities in which they can actually have intimate contacts with problems related to administrative practice. Finally, as already intimated, even if they do develop commitment to administration and opportunities to begin pertinent studies, there is the longer-range problem of achieving a base of operations which will enable them to have uninterrupted careers studying administration.

---

[29] Jack Culbertson, "The Professor of Educational Administration and the Advancement of Knowledge," *UCEA Annual Report—1963-64*. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1964.

Issue Five: Have the extensive efforts of the last fifteen years to develop theory been sufficiently related to empirical work?

As already noted, efforts to understand, to adapt, and to develop theory to advance the science of administration have been substantial. However, some scholars have questioned this strong emphasis and have felt that is has been too sharply divorced from empirical study. Thus, Martin Trow, in reviewing the book edited by Andrew Halpin on *Administrative Theory* questioned the relevance of theory as defined by Feigl and as presented in the book.

> But what relevance has this narrow definition of theory for an infant discipline like educational administration, in which rather elementary ways of thinking and inquiring need to be developed. We walk before we run, and we learn to run by walking and running, not by sitting in our cribs defining the nature of running . . . if the social sciences teach us anything . . . it is that the development of theory of various kinds is not simply the product of acts of will, but is the slow outcome of many efforts to describe, explain and account for specific social phenomena.[30]

An examination of the various theories presented in *Administrative Theory* will show that, with the exception of Getzel's "social process" theory, they have generated few propositions which have been put to the empirical test. At the same time it should be recognized that such theories as those presented by Hemphill and Shartle have grown out of substantial empirical work. Perhaps the issue raised by Trow is closely related to the old problem of an inductive versus a deductive approach to developing knowledge. Another way of examining the issue is to think of levels of research and to seek to determine those most generally appropriate for advancing the study of administration.

One level, sometimes considered rudimentary, is that of case research in which students of public administration, among others, have had substantial interest. In the mid-thirties, for example, a group of scholars launched a case program which was based upon the assumption that the *process* of public administration could be studied as a science.[31] The various issues and trends specifically associated with the movement have been set forth elsewhere by James Heaphey and, therefore, will not be considered here.[32]

---

[30] Martin Trow, "Book Reviews," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 4 1959-60, p. 125.

Among the behavorial scientists, the anthropologists have been the strongest advocates of case research. Certainly, an argument can be made for using the method at this stage in the study of administration. However, specific issues associated with representative sampling, with typical versus atypical cases, with implicit versus explicit theoretical perspectives, with descriptive versus explanatory approaches to case development, must be faced by those who would do case research.[33]

Another level of research that is typically used in the early stages of a science is taxonomic inquiry. More than two thousand years ago, for example, the Greeks classified the natural elements into earth, fire, air and water. This global and imprecise beginning has evolved over the centuries into a much more precise and refined set of concepts as now represented in the periodic tables.

Clearly, taxonomic work has been central to the development of many sciences. Wiener has pointed up the role of taxonomic inquiry in biology.

> It is hard to see how biological science could have entered a properly dynamic period except for the continual gathering of more descriptive natural history. The great botanist Linnaeus will serve us as an example. For Linnaeus, species and genera were fixed aristotelian forms, rather than signposts for a process of evolution; but it was only on the basis of a thoroughly Linnaean description that any cogent case could ever be made for evolution.[34]

As early as four decades ago, the development of classifications in administration was perhaps not more advanced than the Greeks were two thousand years ago in their classifications for dealing with the natural elements. It was only in the last decade, for example, that such global concepts as "man," "job," and "setting" (which in precision and usefulness are perhaps analogous to "earth, fire, air and water") were systematically analyzed and efforts were made to interrelate them and to devise sub-concepts from them.

---

[31] William Anderson, "Report of the Committee on Public Administration of the Social Science Research Council, 1934-1945," *Part I of Research in Public Administration*. Chicago: Public Administration Service, 1945.

[32] James Heaphey, "The Problem of Theory and Case Research" in Jack Culbertson and Stephen Hencley (eds.), *Educational Research: New Perspectives*. Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1963, pp. 266 and ff.

[33] See Jack Culbertson, Paul Jacobson, and Theodore Reller, "Preparation Cases" in *Administrative Relationships: A Casebook*. New York: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1960, pp. 51-72.

Also see Cyril Sargent and Eugene Belisle, "Some Aspects of Administrative Situations and Cases" in *Educational Administration: Cases and Concepts*. New York: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1955.

[34] Norbert Wiener, *The Human Use of Human Beings*. New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1956, 67-68.

Paul Cullinan in a doctoral dissertation has recently sought to study administration by using principles and procedures of taxonomic inquiry gleaned from biology.[35] A UCEA-sponsored project now getting under way to be financed by the Cooperative Research Program and to be headed by Daniel Griffiths will involve taxonomic research in educational administration. The method may prove promising as an approach to advancing the study of educational administration.

Egon Guba has classified educational research into four categories: experiments, studies, surveys and investigation.[36] The classes are developed from two criteria: adequacy of sample, and control of variables. Experiments meet both criteria, and investigations meet neither. Studies meet the control criterion but not the sampling one, while with the survey, it is the other way around. Professor Guba concludes his discussion on the following note which also has relevance for the issue at hand:

> ...each type has some utility for answering certain kinds of questions. We as researchers need not feel guilty or ashamed about utilizing any of these four levels, provided they are suitable to the questions we seek to answer....On the other hand, we must be aware that a variety of errors can be made in interpreting each kind of inquiry.[37]

NEXT STEPS

By way of general conclusion, then, there has been much ferment in the study of administration during the last two decades. That the movement has had a substantial impact upon educational administration is cleary indicated in a study of changes in preparatory programs made and published by the Committee for the Advancement of School Administration in 1964.[38] The most frequently reported change for the period 1958-62 was the increased use of the social and behavioral sciences in preparatory programs for administrators. It is also noteworthy that a recent study made by Judson Shaplin of the professorship in educational administration in UCEA universities, revealed that a demand has been created in recent years for specialists prepared to teach theories of administration.[39]

---

[35] Cullinan, *op. cit.*

[36] Egon Guba, "Experiments, Studies, Surveys and Investigations" in Jack Culbertson and Stephen Hencley (eds.), *Educational Research: New Perspectives*. Danville, Ilinois: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1963.

[37] *Ibid.*, p. 248.

[38] American Association of School Administrators, *The Professional Preparation of Superintendents of Schools*, 1964.

[39] Judson Shaplin, "The Professorship: Attracting Talented Personnel" in Donald Willower and Jack Culbertson (eds.) *The Professorship in Educational Administration*. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1964.

While much has been accomplished in the study of administration within the recent past, much remains to be achieved within the longer-range view. I would like to end this paper by pointing to potential next steps which might further advance the study of administration.

In 1955, Dwight Waldo wrote:[40] "Indeed, no discipline is without relevance for administration—and administrative study has relevance for every discipline." Such remarks in the fifties helped to broaden our perspectives. Today, however, I would suggest that the goal of limiting and defining the boundaries of administration should receive high priority. Can we, in other words, create arrangements designed to give better definition to the field which, in turn, would provide interested scholars opportunities to integrate their efforts more effectively? In this regard perhaps the staff of the Research and Development Center of the University of Oregon might consider the possibility of initiating a five-year project which would help bring the field of organizational behavior and administration into sharper focus. Implementing such a project would require the talents of the most outstanding and motivated scholars of the nation. Its planning would demand substantial work, perhaps the time of one staff member for at least a one-year period. This staff member would also need the thoughtful advice of outstanding professors of educational administration and social scientists. The goal might be to identify and set forth the various sub-structures in the social science disciplines which are most pertinent to educational administration. Experience such as that gained in planning the seven-volume study of the science of psychology would have relevance for conceptualizing such a project.[41]

A second goal which should have high priority, if we are to advance the study of administration, is that of recruiting larger numbers of scholars who will devote their careers to studying organizational behavior and administration. Because the current patterns of recruiting professors *after* they have had substantial teaching and administrative experience are limited in relation to the goal of advancing knowledge, new approaches to recruiting will undoubtedly develop. One already emerging in a few institutions involves the recruitment of personnel in their twenties after they have received Master of Arts or similar degrees and after they have had three to six years public school experience. From this pattern younger professors, who have a substantial number of years of scholarly activity ahead of them, can emerge. This pattern deserves wider use.

Developments of the last fifteen years make it feasible, in spite of the difficulties noted above, to think about creating programs which would attract, in a more systematic fashion, persons from graduate and undergraduate social science disciplines to the study of administration. This is true because there is an increasing number of universities where there are informally organized groups of scholars interested in such areas as the politics of education, the sociology of organizations, the economics of education and related subjects. The groups often include professors of educational administration as well as other social scientists. From such communication channels could come more systematic and constructive programs for attracting persons into the study of administration.

---

[40] Waldo, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

[41] Sigmund Koch (ed.) *Psychology: Study of a Science*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1959, Vol. I.

Would it be possible, for example, for a few universities to give priority to the training function and to develop inter-university recruiting arrangements to support this function? To illustrate the point, one university might develop a special program to prepare scholars to study the politics of education; another might concentrate upon the economics of education; still another might be oriented to the sociology of organization; and so forth.

Each of these institutions could develop communication arrangements with interested scholars in other institutions where there are strong undergraduate and master's programs and from which doctoral candidates might be recruited. With the development of cogent rationales and sufficient communication between and among those in participating institutions, cooperative arrangements could perhaps be developed. If five-score top scholars, let us say, could be prepared and placed over a five-year period, a major contribution to the study of administration would be made.

My final suggestion would be that a few universities try out the idea of implementing what might be called a Graduate College of Public Policy and Administration. The title, of the College, you will note, implies a concern for theory and for valuing, for policy as well as process. Scholars from such disciplines as economics, political science, sociology, psychology, anthropology, philosophy, law, history and administration could constitute the staff of the College. Some of the staff might be more interested in value inquiry and in organizing information and concepts of use to educational, and other governmental leaders interested in updating organizational purposes and programs to meet emerging needs of society. They would, in other words, concern themselves directly with "ought" questions. Should, for example, superintendents and school board officials encourage members of the American Federation of Teachers to use traditional bargaining procedures in salary negotiations? Should the Labor Department play an increasing role in education and in re-training in this country? Should vocational and technical education programs be shifted from high schools to the community colleges?

In seeking answers to such questions, it is not possible to derive hypotheses and to validate them scientifically. However, systematic and objective modes of inquiry can be employed and the dangers of unfounded generalizations can be avoided. At the national level, for example, the Council of Economic Advisors provides organized information and advice pertinent to presidential decision-making on economic and social policies. Although the information and concepts presented are not "scientific," in a strict sense, they are valuable. It is also significant that their value depends upon the quality of research and analysis which produces them.

It seems very important to have a substantial cadre of scholars focusing upon public policy because educational, economic, governmental, social and related issues are markedly intertwined and organizations are increasingly interdependent. Over a period of years a College of Public Policy and Administration might recruit several groups of scholars who would focus upon different substantive areas of policy. Work might be initiated, however, in one area. A recent Gallup Poll, for example, reveals that race relations, for the first time in "Gallup Poll" history, is seen as the number one problem facing the American people. It is obvious, however, that the problem is not limited to education. There are issues of public policy related to housing, to employment opportunities, to civil rights, to adult re-training and to other matters which impinge upon the problem. There is widespread recognition that decisions are often made about these and other issues of public policy at the national, regional, state and local level with inadequate information. Better illumination of such issues could be a unique contribution of a Graduate College of Public Policy and Administration. Clearly the issues are inter-related and scholars from various disciplines could shed light upon them.

A substantial part of the college staff would concentrate upon the scientific or "is" aspects of administration, as contrasted with the "ought" aspects. The psycho-sociological, the economic and the political dimensions of administration would be the focus of their investigations. They would apply the concepts and modes of inquiry from different disciplines to study such matters as community, organizational, group and individual decision-making as these bear upon administration and upon organizational behavior. These staff members would concentrate more upon the slow and long-range problem of building structures of knowledge and less directly upon the gathering and organizing of information to illuminate issues of public policy. Staff members with this orientation might also concentrate more upon the comparative aspects of administration to complement work already underway in existing departments of administration.

The two groups of scholars would not work in isolation, since the results of their respective labors should be relevant and supportive to each of their differing activities. Thus, findings about the real world should help scholars think about "ought" questions and objective data on policy issues might suggest problems needing study within a scientific framework. Certainly, a sharp fact-value dichotomy would not be operative.

Although the high priority function of the College would be the *study* of administration, its training role would also need clarification. This would involve specifying the relationships of the College to existing departments of educational, business and public administration. Several alternative arrangements can be projected. One possibility would be to make its scholarly products available to existing departments and, thereby, assume no direct training role. Another alternative would be to provide courses on substantive issues of policy and on administration *qua* administration for students in education, business, government and related departments. The working out of complementary and supportive relationships with the various existing departments in a cooperative fashion would be still another arrangement.

Some years ago the Russell Sage Foundation surveyed the problems encountered when social scientists seek to be of service to such professions as law, education and medicine. Almost all of the 255 problems identified in the study fell into three classes: cultural differences stemming from diverse backgrounds and specializations of individuals; situational factors associated with status and rigid bureaucratic procedures; and unclarified conceptions of self and of the expectations of others.[42] All of these problems and more would have to be met in establishing and implementing a College of Public Policy and Administration. Whether or not these problems can be met successfully in establishing a College of Public Policy and Administration or some other organization with similar functions will be an important test of leadership in universities. Meeting this test involves a more fundamental issue. In an age of both increasing complexity and enhanced interdependence, in a period when unprecedented issues confront administrators and policy makers, and in a day when we face the increasingly knottier problem of usefully relating the knowledge of highly specialized scholars to problems generally relevant to citizens, the success of our efforts to achieve needed adaptations in universities may be a test ultimately of society itself.

Appreciation is expressed to a number of persons who provided the writer reactions to an earlier draft of this paper: Glenn Immegart and Kenneth St. Clair, former UCEA staff members; Don Anderson, Edwin Bridges, Paul Cullinan, Loren Downey, Bryce Fogarty and Robert Ruderman, current UCEA staff members.

---

[42] Russell Sage Foundation, Annual Report, 1958-59. New York: 505 Park Avenue, 1960, pp. 7-16.

2

Research and Theory in Educational Administration

By

DANIEL E. GRIFFITHS

Research and Theory in Educational Administration

DANIEL E. GRIFFITHS
School of Education
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

IN 1959, I was asked by Roy Hall to write a monograph entitled *Research in Educational Administration: An Appraisal and a Plan.* Since I had just completed a speech on a similar topic for The University Council for Educational Administration, I enlarged upon it and the monograph was published.[1] This paper brings the earlier monograph "up to date," and allows me the privilege of looking again at educational administration. It is also possible to consider what has happened in the five intervening years and to take into account what others have had to say about research in educational administration. The format of this paper is, first, to state the problem in terms of definition and, second, to analyze the field by answering four questions:

1. Who does the research?
2. What research is done?
3. How is the research reported?
4. How is the research used?

Since a number of recommendations of the earlier appraisal have been implemented, these will be incorporated into the paper as appropriate. Although evidence will be reported where available and known to me, this paper must be considered as a personal appraisal.

---

[1] Daniel E. Griffiths, *Research in Educational Administration: An Appraisal and a Plan*. New York: Teachers College Bureau of Publication, 1959.

THE PROBLEM

What is Research?

The term "research" is used widely and broadly with many and varied meanings. Despite this there is an underlying and significant similarity in all these uses. When one speaks of research he is speaking of a *method of inquiry*, that is, he is speaking of the process by which one ascertains the "truth" of the matter at hand. A definition is offered by English: "research, *n.* systematic, detailed, and relatively prolonged attempt to discover or confirm the facts that bear upon a certain problem or problems and the laws of principles that govern it."[2]

This definition imparts the *technical* sense of the word "research," but it does not impart the essence of the term. Research is more than investigation, more than gathering evidence, more than getting at the truth; it is a point of view, a frame of mind, a dynamic personal orientation. The man who is truly a researcher differs from other men in the way in which he looks at the world, the way in which he views his universe. Kettering expressed this dimension of research thus:

> Research is a high-hat word that scares a lot of people. It needn't. It is rather simple. Essentially, it is nothing but a state of mind—a friendly, welcoming attitude toward change. Going out to look for change, instead of waiting for it to come. Research, for practical men, is an effort to do things better and not to be caught asleep at the switch. The research state of mind can apply to anything. Personal affairs or any kind of business, big or little. It is the problem-solving mind as contrasted with the let-well-enough-alone mind. It is the composer mind, instead of the fiddler mind; it is the "tomorrow" mind, instead of the "yesterday" mind.[3]

The researcher is a person who is never content with the *status in quo*. He sees in all things a challenge to do better; to explain more fully; to integrate all knowledge; to produce a system of thought which unifies the knowledge in his field. The researcher is curious and creative. To him, all problems are opportunities to create and develop solutions, not reasons for despair.

So research may be better described as a frame of mind, rather than as a set of techniques. We can teach the techniques but we have, as yet, not been able systematically to teach students to be creative, curious, and productive.

Basic or Applied Research. Whenever one embarks on a discussion of research the question always arises as to whether the research being discussed is "basic" or "applied." The fact that it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to delineate between the two does not diminish the heat of the discussion. The Mellon Foundation recently published *A Brief Anthology of Fundamental Scientific Research* which included sixteen statements that attempted to clarify the difference between the two adjectives. The statements by Huxley and Barnard seemed to make considerable sense and might well be considered in seeking to clarify the dichotomy. Huxley has this to offer.

---

[2] Horace B. English and Ava Champney English, *A Comprehensive Dictionary of Psychological and Psychoanalytic Terms.* New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1958, p. 459.

[3] C. F. Kettering, "More Music Please, Composers!" *Saturday Evening Post*, Vol. 211, No. 32, 1938.

> I often wish that the phrase "applied science" had never been invented. For it suggests that there is a sort of scientific knowledge of direct practical use which can be studied apart from another sort of scientific knowledge, which is of no practical utility, and which is termed "pure science." But there is no more complete fallacy than this. What people call applied science is nothing but the application of pure science to particular classes of problems.[4]

Barnard offers this:

> The suggestion that basic research must have no practical motive or immediate application creates a dilemma . . . the full story would require display of the interdependence between basic and applied research and would not minimize the fact that traffic in inspiration, ideas and techniques moves in both directions. Whether a given research project deserves to be classified as basic or applied must ultimately be a matter of personal opinion.[5]

Suffice it to say that in reseach in educational administration we are concerned with both basic and applied research—regardless of how each is defined. Let the discussion of the categorization of activities come after the research has been completed; not before.

What is Educational Administration?

One can reasonably raise the question of what constitutes the subject matter—the content—of educational administration. Just as medicine draws its contents from a wide variety of disciplines (i.e., psychology to zoology), so too must educational administration draw its contents from many arts and sciences. Disconcerting as it seems to be, one must look to all human thought for the sources of the content of administration. The synthesizing and narrowing agent should be the theory which the field develops. That we have not yet developed this theory, or even a generally accepted taxonomy, should be recognized as an urgent problem.[6] The development of such theory should be given high priority.

---

[4] T. H. Huxley, "Science and Culture," an address delivered at the opening of Sir Josiah Mason's College, Birmingham, England, 1880.

[5] Chester I. Barnard, "A National Science Policy," *Scientific American*, November 1957.

[6] For a discussion of this and related points see Daniel E. Griffiths, *Administrative Theory*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959.

The criterion of similarity governs the range of institutions with which educational administration is concerned. This means that elementary, secondary, and higher education including junior and community colleges, liberal arts and specialized colleges and universities, and graduate schools including professional schools are subsumed under the general category of educational administration. The problems of administration in all these institutions are so much alike that a single department of educational administration within a graduate school could very well envelope all the foregoing specializations.

The practice of educational administration should then be construed as the art and science of applying knowledge, largely from the social sciences, to the problems of administration in the institutions mentioned above. The researcher and theoretician in educational administration is concerned with creating knowledge and suggesting its application for the guidance of the practitioners.

AN APPRAISAL OF RESEARCH IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

A few years ago Lamke wrote a devastating statement about research in teacher personnel, a statement which holds generally for research in all of educational administration:

> If the research during the last three years were to be wiped out in the fields of medicine, agriculture, physics, or chemistry, our lives would be materially changed. If research in the area of teacher personnel during the last three years should vanish, education and educators would continue much as usual. There are relatively few studies among the some 500 reported here which will, or should, widely affect educational practice.[7]

Lamke makes a point which is of crucial importance. Research should be of as much worth to administrators as it is to farmers. Should agricultural research cease and extension services be eliminated, the results would be felt soon by most of the farmers in the country. And yet a decrease in research in educational administration would concern few people. The point is that research in educational administration has not been very significant, nor has it been regarded very highly by practitioners.

Assuming that Lamke is correct, and I am strongly of the opinion that he is, what, specifically, is the matter? In order to get at the problem in a systematic manner we shall consider the four questions mentioned above. Each question leads logically to the next and each has implications for the other three.

Who Does the Research?

This section deals with the manpower aspects of educational research—with such questions as: Who does the research? What kind of training do these people have? What orientation do they have? What specific inadequacies are apparent?

---

[7] Tom A. Lamke, in *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 25, No. 3 (June 1955), p. 192.

One of the difficulties in generalizing about who does research is the lack of systematic research on researchers. When one does gather some information, it becomes obvious that little research is done, that few people do it, and that these people are not professors of educational administration.

Table I contains a comparison of projects in educational administration and the total number approved by year in the Cooperative Research Program of the U.S. Office of Education. In the eight years of the program there have been 47 grants for research and research activities. This constitutes 5.1 per cent of the total number approved. While all of the significant research in educational administration is not restricted to the CRB, the Branch is the only source of large funds, and is practically the only source which has a quality control.

Table I

COOPERATIVE RESEARCH EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND EDUCATION RESEARCH AND RESEARCH ACTIVITIES BY YEAR 1957-1964 (1964 INCOMPLETE)*

Educational Administration *Year*	*Number*	Total Cooperative Research Branch *Number*	Per cent E.A. of Total *Per cent*
1957	2	77	2.5
1958	2	56	3.6
1959	5	87	5.8
1960	7	80	8.8
1961	9	95	9.5
1962	6	115	5.2
1963	5	149	3.0
1964 inc.	11	257	4.3
Total	47	916	5.1

* Projects are counted according to beginning date of contract.

Source: *Cooperative Research Projects*: A Seven Year Summary, July 1, 1956-June 30, 1963 and *Cooperative Research Projects*: Approved in Fiscal Year 1964.

When the people receiving grants are scrutinized it is found that three men received nine contracts, or 19 per cent of the total, and eight men received 19 contracts, or 40 per cent of the total. Table II gives the names, number of grants and universities of those with two or three projects. It should be noted that no university is mentioned twice, further evidence of the thinness of research talent.

I next examined the 47 projects to determine the discipline of the principal investigator. With facilities available at the time I arrived at answers for 43 of the 47 and the results by year are given in Table III. While it is difficult to draw trends because of the small number, some interesting conclusions can be drawn. Fewer than half of the projects are directed by educational administration personnel. When one considers, for example, that the seven projects directed by sociologists were directed by only three men, it is rather clear that only a smattering of men from "other" disciplines have given tangible evidence of interest in educational administration.

Table II

NAMES AND UNIVERSITIES OF THOSE RECEIVING TWO OR THREE GRANTS FROM THE COOPERATIVE RESEARCH BRANCH

Name	*University*	*Number*
Bashur	Eastern Michigan	2
Corwin	Ohio State	2
Griffiths	Teachers College and NYU	3
Gross	Harvard	3
James	Stanford	3
Kreitlow	Wisconsin	2
Morphet and Shutz	California	2
Pellegrin	Oregon	2
		19

Table III

PROJECTS RELATED TO EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION CLASSIFIED BY PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS AND YEAR CONTRACTED

	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	Total	Per Cent
Educational Administration	2[1]	1	1[2]	2	6[2]	1	3	3	19	44.1
Sociology			1	2		1		3	7	16.3
Psychology			1	1	1	1	1		5	11.6
Political Science			1	1		1			3	6.9
Education		1	1		1	1		2	6	13.9
Economics				1					1	2.3
Engineering					1				1	2.3
Public Administration						1			1	2.3
Totals	2	2	5	7	9	6	4[3]	8[4]	43	99.7

[1] With communications specialist.

[2] With psychologist.

[3] Maloan (Michigan) discipline not known.

[4] Minot (Northwestern), Height (Pine Manor J.C.), Grambisch (Minnesota) discipline not known.

It appears that most of the research is done by graduate students. This is true even at the Midwest Administration Center, which has been the most productive institute in educational administration to date. Dependence on research by graduate students has serious drawbacks. Most graduate students in educational administration are part-time students. This implies a minimum of supervision on the part of the professor. It also means, in all probability, that the student is holding a full-time teaching or administrative position. The research which results is necessarily narrow and is usually done poorly. Under the circumstances, how could it be done otherwise?

We should also consider the further consequences of the failure of professors to do research. If the professor is not engaged in significant research how can he stimulate his students? The student may be expected to mirror his adviser's attitude toward research. At the present we are running in a circle, but now is the time to break out.

It must be acknowledged that research in educational administration is a part-time occupation for all but a handful of men in this country. One of the issues to be decided is whether we should continue on this basis or whether an effort should be made to make research a full-time occupation.

Orientation of Researchers. With few exceptions the workers in educational administration suffer from an "ought" orientation. They ask, "What ought we to do?" "What is good?" These are ethical questions, questions of value. While they are important questions they cannot be answered through the activities of researchers. For example, if one asks, "What is a good salary schedule?" and then surveys the field to determine prevailing practice, he is *not* then able to say that he knows what a *good* salary schedule is. As contrasted with this orientation the researcher should be oriented to theory. The theoretician asks the question, "What will happen as a consequence of having salary schedule 'A' in school 'X'?" The theoretician is always concerned with explanation and when he does use values they are used as variables. For example, the theoretician asks, "If I introduce a merit salary schedule into a democratic atmosphere, what will result?" The orientation of the theoretician is missing from the educational administration scene and this is one of the major reasons for the research predicament we are now in.

The entire field of professional education and therefore the climate in which the graduate student and the researcher lives is "value bound" and "practice oriented." As a result, the prevailing research bent of the field seems to be to find "promising practices." We have followed the illusory rainbow of promising practices and now we have the pot. It is not a pot of gold. At a time when we badly need a unifying theory our research is at the molecular level—we report on what some administrator has described as working for him and expect that his approach will have universal application. The fact that a citizen committee helps one community to win a bond vote, yet the same committee approach in another community does not succeed is illustrative. A citizen committee is but one way of increasing interaction and it is interaction that is important, not the committee. If research on bond votes had a theoretical basis (such as interaction theory) the differences in amount of interaction that different procedures produced would be reported, not merely that citizen committees were formed.

It is time that the whole field reconsider its basic orientation and revise its outlook on research methodology. We are the strange profession which (so to speak) appears to put its hopes on the work of engineers rather than building on the work of physicists.

Specific Inadequacies of Researchers. What are the specific inadequacies of researchers in educational administration? There are many, just as there are in all types of research, but we shall look at three which seem particularly relevant to this discussion. These are provincialism; statistical naivete; and data fixation. They are discussed because they suggest other inadequacies which could be remedied if these three were remedied.

1. Provincialism. There are two general kinds of provincialism that we face in educational administration. The first is that we have tended to work in isolation from researchers in other disciplines. Fortunately, this type of provincialism is dying fast and its extinction should be hastened.

The second type of provincialism is geographical and this is apparently deeply ingrained. If one were to examine the books in our field, even some of the more recent books, he might wonder if certain parts of the country were without mail service since the only references given are those which emanated from the university of the author. The practice of referring only to one's own or one's colleagues' work results in each researcher working by himself and never results in programatic research. It prevents research findings from ever being "fitted together" to make a more significant contribution. So long as geographic provincialism prevails, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to do large research projects in all parts of the country.

2. Statistical naivete. Many of the reports which appear in the field of educational administration attempt to use statistical methods. However, the statistics are limited to the use of means, differences of the means, and correlations. Any number of studies appearing in the educational administration journals offer, for example, as proof that "Method A" of teaching mathematics is better than "Method B" the fact that the mean of a test of one class is 32.1 and the mean of the second class is 30.9. On reading the studies one is instantly struck by

the thought that the differences given are completely within the realm of chance and so the differences mean little, if anything. The omission of tests of the significance of differences of means is common and prevents the reader from knowing what the experiment did demonstrate.

We still experience great difficulty in the use of correlations. They are computed in large quantities and used indiscriminately. Apparently many believe that "correlation is causation," because any number of studies, upon finding a correlation of, say, .7 between two factors admonish us to do the one to obtain the other.

These two relatively simple points have been stressed to make the point that we need much more statistical sophistication "across the board." We need it for researchers so they will not delude others, and we need it for practicing administrators so they will not be deluded.

3. Data fixation. What happens to the researcher—and his product—when he becomes a slave to arithmetic? Boulding suggests some answers to this question:

> The intellectual disease of analyzing data to the *exclusion* of the situation may be called data fixation. Its principal symptom is a certain obsessiveness with arithmetic—the feeling that once a number has been arrived at by a recognized statistical ritual something has been accomplished. The article that is sandwiched between tables and peppered with coefficients of correlation and statistical tests of significance is highly suspect in this regard. There are too many spurious quantities in social science research. I must confess that I regard the invention of statistical pseudo-quantities like the coefficient of correlation as one of the minor intellectual disasters of our time; it has provided legions of students and investigators with opportunities to substitute arithmetic for thought on a grand scale. Arithmetic is so much easier than thonght that the temptation to make the substitution is almost irresistible. When the arithmetic is performed by electronic calculators, the substitution is even more disastrous. I recall a remark of the great statistician and econometrician Henry Schultz that the great value of statistical computation (this was in the days of hand computers) was that it got the investigator thoroughly familiar with his data. Now, alas, only the I.B.M. machine gets thoroughly familiar with his data; the investigator does not. His data are served up to him in a variety of digested forms, and he surveys a product, which is as far removed from the data as the data from the situation.[8]

Thus we have a description of how many researchers become engrossed in statistical manipulations to the complete ignoring of what the data mean or from whence the data come. Data fixation is another side of the coin of statistical naivete—and a side equally to be avoided.

Summary. This section has had as its concern the man in research. It was pointed out that graduate students, people outside of educational administraton, professors, and practitioners do research in approximately that order. The small amount of research done by professors was stressed as a matter of serious concern. It was noted that the field of educational administration is "value bound" and "practice oriented" and the meaning of this in terms of research was elaborated upon. Specific shortcomings such as provincialism, statistical naievete, and data fixation were spelled out.

---

[8] Kenneth E. Boulding, "Evidences for an Administrative Science," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 3, No. 1 (June 1958), pp. 16, 17.

What Research is Done?

Our discussion begins with the research undertaken in educational administration. The method used is not to enumerate all the various studies of any past period of time, but rather to discuss problems and, where appropriate, to illustrate by reference to specific studies. Many questions are raised as to whether the quantity of research is sufficient, whether we are studying fruitful leads, whether we have sufficient theory, and whether our language is adequate, to mention just a few.

Theory Inadequacies. Without doubt, the greatest weaknes of research in educational administration is the lack of theory. Most studies in educational administration are done at the level of "naked empiricism." By this we mean that the researcher has an idea that a vaguely defined problem needs to be solved. He collects data through a questionnaire, survey, or some other method and attempts to find an answer by "looking at the data." By following this procedure we have amassed tons of data, but have come up with very few answers. The opposite of "naked empiricism" is research based on theory. By this is meant that the researcher starts with a well-defined problem, a set of clearly stated assumptions, and from these assumptions he deduces by logico-mathematical methods a set of testable hypotheses. Theory is essentially a set of assumptions from which a set of empirical laws (principles) may be derived.[9]

In order to "take a reading" on a set of research projects, I obtained and read 31 statements on research in educational administration sponsored by CRB. Some were summaries of proposals; others, of final reports. I analyzed these in terms of types of data collection, methods of analysis, and use of theoretical or conceptual frameworks. While it was very difficult to draw conclusions because of the variety of reports, differences in format, and lack of specificity, I did make judgments based upon what was written and occasionally on my knowledge of the projects. Nine could be said to be theory-based, and seven used a conceptual framework. Since there was some overlap, a total of 14 projects employed a conceptual framework or related to theory. Only seven tested hypotheses derived from theory.

---

[9] For a more complete discussion of theory in administration see Daniel E. Griffiths, *Administrative Theory*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959.

While this appears to be a very small number, I believe, that it represents an increase over past practice.

Other sources give us similar conclusions. Michael, writing in the *Review of Educational Research's* issue on Teacher Personnel for 1963, states:

> If one examines recent issues of the Review and compares them with those of five or ten years ago, it appears that there is an increase in the proportion of articles cited in the bibliographies that reflect concern with experimental vertification of hypotheses or of predictions derived from a theoretical structure . . . In this issue, the reader will note that except for Chapter VII relatively little of the research reported can be regarded as theoretical in its orientation—a fact which is due probably in part to the nature of the topics considered.[10]

Gregg, writing in the 1961 issue of the *Review*, makes this contrast:

> Comparison of the October 1952 issue of the Review on educational organization, administration, and finance with this issue indicated a marked and significant trend in the nature of research in educational administration during the past decade. The trend has been from an overwhelming emphasis on descriptive, normative studies, to a relatively heavy emphasis on empirical studies based on theoretical constructs.[11]

The conclusion appears to be that educational administration is moving in the direction of research that is more theory-based than that of the past.

Criteria. The content of a science must be capable of being tested by any intelligent person who has the technical equipment to make the necessary observations. Much of what is discussed in administrative literature then falls outside the scope of scientific inquiry. Those intuitions, hunches, and feelings which cannot be tested are *not* the subject matter of a scientific study of administration. This is not to say that they are not important, but that they are not scientific.

The second criterion of scientific knowledge is concerned with the degree to which a bit of knowledge can be verified by confirmation of others working on the same bit. Probably the surest way to distinguish between "opinion" and "knowledge" (well substantiated belief) is in terms of the degree to which the same conclusion is arrived at by numerous investigators using the same data in the same manner. In educational administration we have generally not subjected our findings to the test of reliability. As a consequence we have published endless lists of *principles* which are actually little more than lists of unverified *opinion*. As an example: one standard text on educational administration lists some thirty-five "principles" for the construction of a salary schedule—a greater number of principles than is to be found in a standard physics textbook!

---

[10] William C. Michael, "Teacher Personnel: A Brief Evaluation of the Research Reviewed," *Review of Educational Research*, October, 1963, Vol. XXXIII, No. 4, p. 443.

[11] Russell T. Gregg, "Foreword," *Review of Educational Research*, October 1961, Vol. XXXI, No. 4, p. 351.

A science is marked by the use of concepts (terms to which particular meanings have been attached) which are defined operationally. At present, a major task facing researchers in educational administration is the definition of concepts in terms of the operations to be used in gathering data.

Scientific knowledge differs in part from common-sense knowledge in the comprehensiveness of its scope. Through the use of abstract concepts a great range of concrete events can be organized and interpreted. The abstract concepts also enable us to generalize and so further extend our knowledge.

A science is not merely a collection of miscellaneous items of information, but rather it is a related account of the facts. This takes the form of classification systems and the like for description, and sets of laws or theoretical assumptions for explanation. The scientific treatment of facts results in their being integrated into a coherent, unifying structure.[12]

Research in educational administration faces a long hard pull in its effort to become more scientific. It must reorient itself and must become based on theory rather than naked empiricism.

Taxonomic problems. An essential step which must be taken in the developmental path from art to science is the classification of information. Although educational administration, as a field of study, is well over a half-century old we are just now seriously considering the problem of classifying the information which we have. A taxonomy is a classification of data according to their natural relationships or the principles governing such classifications. Taxonomies have served useful purposes in practically all the sciences. In fact, one could probably make a very good argument to support the contention that any science begins with a taxonomy. Possibly the most widely known administrative taxonomy is POSDCORB[13] which, when developed, was the ultimate in administration thought.[14] POSDCORB was the result of an effort to put into a single table all the functions of administration. It can be readily seen that if more restraint or more enthusiasm had been employed the POSDCORB formulation could have been contracted or expanded. If a taxonomy is built without a solid theoretical base it is a mere formalizing of one's opinion.

---

[12] For a clear and comprehensive discussion of the meaning of science and theory see Herbert Feigl, "The Scientific Outlook: Naturalism and Humanism," in Herbert Feigl and May Brodbeck (eds.), *Readings in the Philosophy of Science*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953, pp. 8-18.

[13] POSDCORB is a word made up of the first letters of planning, organizing, staffing, directing, cooperating, reporting, and budgeting.

[14] Luther Gulick, "Notes on the Theory of Organization," in Luther Gulick and L. Urwick (eds.), *Papers on the Science of Administration*. New York: Institute of Public Administration, 1937, pp. 3-45.

In educational administration several taxonomies have been advanced in recent years. Among these have been the Tri-dimensional Concept;[15] the Competency Pattern;[16] and the School-Community Development Study.[17] Each of these taxonomies was developed as three CPEA (Cooperative Program in Educational Administration) centers started to do research in educational administration. Each found, as they commenced work, that there was no satisfactory taxonomy in the literature and so began to develop their own. While each was of some use to its creators, all suffered from the weakness inherent in the taxonomic approch. Of all the shortcomings the confusion between genotypic and phenotypic categories is most harmful. The confusion in categorizing not only gives the researcher trouble in his classification chores, but it leads to erroneous generalizations which are then taught to students as facts. To illustrate this point: there is now being circulated the notion that money is not particularly related to morale of teachers. One study reported that "fair compensation" was rated eighth on a list of factors.[18] A closer reading of the study reveals that women teachers rated "fair compensation" tenth and men teachers rated it second. The study sampled two and a half times as many women as men so when men and women were thrown together "fair compensation" ended up eighth (relatively unimportant). Other than reasserting what should be obvious—that men and women constitute genotypic categories and that teachers constitute a phenotypic category—we should revolt against the indiscriminate mixing of the sexes. Of course, one could properly object to the checklist method of studying morale too, but more about this later.

The dilemma should be apparent by now; we must classify our data in some fashion which makes sense. Yet to do this without an adequate theory appears to be a fruitless activity. It is practically impossible to derive testable hypotheses from a taxonomy, yet to make progress in research and theory development we must have testable hypotheses. The solution probably lies in the direction of arriving at a theoretical basis and building a taxonomy upon it. The taxonomy can then be revised as the theory is developed. The most heuristic taxonomies of the physical sciences were built using this approach, as witness the Periodic Table of the Elements. The CRB has recently approved a proposal to build taxonomies of organizational behavior in education, employing the approach suggested above.

---

[15] Devised by Robert Teviot Livingston and Daniel R. Davies. Described and modified by Daniel E. Griffiths in *Human Relations in School Administration.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1956, pp. 4-12.

[16] Southern States Cooperative Program in Educational Administration, *Better Teaching in School Administration.* Nashville: George Peabody College, 1955.

[17] John Ramseyer, and others, *Factors Affecting Educational Administration.* SCDS Monograph Series, No. 2. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 1955.

[18] Peter D. Skilland, "A Teacher Morale Survey," *Educational Forum* Vol. 13 (May 1949), pp. 470-486.

Language. Whenever a field of study interests itself in theory as educational administration is now doing, it becomes more critical of itself. This is generally evidenced by the establishment of higher standards of thought and action, but particularly of writing. The critical perusal of writing in educational administration cannot fail to have a salutary effect on production. Researchers will not be so prone to publish careless, shoddy writing if they know that the work will be reviewed against rigorous standards. We need more constructive criticisms of the work in our field.

We have many language problems which need discussing, but we will talk about just two which, although different, are somewhat related. The first deals with the way in which we write our reports and the second relates to the concepts we use.

A recent study of the superintendency has evoked a number of lively book reviews. One will be quoted (anonymously) not only to give the flavor of how this one report is being received, but also to indicate how, in general, reports of research in our field are received. We do not agree with the reviewer in his estimates of the study as a whole, but we are using the quote because it applies generally to research reports in educational administration.

> The prolixity of the authors' style is matched only by its dullness. The writing is pompous and is replete with jargon. The authors glibly convert nouns into adjectives and unerringly choose weak, inert verbs in preference to strong, active ones . . . To stay with this book, a reader needs a strong sense of duty.

We think the last sentence typifies the mental approach one must take in reading the research in our field. In a way it is fortunate that so many are endowed with such a strong sense of duty or few of our reports would ever be read: We need clear, simple prose in reports of research.

A recent book in educational administration offers the lead into a discussion of language in concept construction. The following two sentences appear in consecutive order: "The terms adaptability and quality are used interchangeably in this book. Of course, they are not the same." The simple questions are asked: If the two terms are not the same why should they be used interchangeably? And if the two terms are used interchangeably why are they not the same?

One of the obstacles to adequate theory and improved research is the lack of concepts for describing administrative situations. I use the word "concept" to mean a term to which a particular meaning has been attached. Once the meaning has been attached to the term, the term should always be used with this particular meaning and conversely, whenever a particular meaning is intended the same term should be used. If we could take this single step forward, that is, the use of the same concept by all to describe the same meaning, it would be a giant step.

We have another difficulty with the concepts we employ. We seem to be chained to concepts which are no longer useful in our research. We are at the same stage as were the alchemists who studied heat, using the caloric concept as the basis for their theorizing. Not until caloric was abandoned and the concept of molecular motion was equated to heat was a science of thermodynamics possible. Concepts such as line and staff, competency, responsibiltiy, democracy, and morale have, at present, little operational value in the study of our problems. There is a crying need for new concepts with which to research and to build administrative theory.

The new concepts should be developed using *operationism* as the method of construction. The idea of operationism is very simple and is stated by Bridgeman as follows: "In general, we mean by any concept nothing more than a set of operations; *the concept is synonymous with the corresponding set of operations.*"[19] In other words, operationism is the way of thinking which holds that concepts are given their meaning by the methods of observation or investigation used to arrive at them, and the concepts have no meaning apart from the operations by which the terms to which they refer are known.

Although we have made some use of operational concepts, Mort, for instance, used "quality of education" generally to mean a score on the instrument known as *The Growing Edge*, but we have not made the application of operationism catholic enough.

Limited Techniques. Lack of an adequate theory and its concomitant, important concepts, has led to the use of techniques not suited to our research objectives. Although there has been a change in educational administration in the past ten years and this change has been reflected in the kind of research undertaken, one aspect of research has remained unchanged. That is the reliance on questionnaires or checklists for the collection of data. At Teachers College, Columbia University, the story is told that if you say to a graduate student, "How is your project coming along?" he will answer, I'm waiting until all my questionnaires come back." There are, of course, certain types of research which can best be done by questionnaire or checklist, but these instruments should be restricted to those particular topics and not used regardless of the subject of the research. In recent years we have seen the questionnaire used to gather data on administrative behavior, human relations, and administrative process—all topics new to research. Studies using the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) are illustrative of the case in point: The LBDQ is a checklist of administrator behaviors; and the administrator, his subordinates, and his superiors indicate on the checklist how they perceive the behavior of the administrator. Thus the LBDQ gives an indication of how an administrator perceives himself and how others perceive him. These perceptions have been equated with behavior in the reports published on the LBDQ and herein lies the problem.[20] It is valuable to study self-reported perceptions but it is misleading to equate these with behavior. We need different methods of gathering data so that we can have behavioral data to solve behavioral problems not perceptual data.

---

[19] Percy W. Bridgeman, *The Logic of Modern Physics.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927, p. 5.

Recent years have seen the use of new techniques including simulation and the field study. Probably the most ambitious simulation study was the DCS project in which an elementary school was replicated and the administrative performance of principals was studied.[21] The field study has been used more frequently in recent years and is to be highly recommended. The stages in this type of study are:[22]

> (1) The investigator approaches the school system with as few preconceptions as possible and endeavors to describe as precisely as possible what he sees, hears, and senses.
>
> (2) The investigator refines his conceptual framework throughout the duration of the study.
>
> (3) The investigator searches for understanding of the patterns of action which his study has isolated.

Example of the field-study technique are Iannaccone's work in the Whitman School and Atwood's study of the introduction of a guidance department in a New York City high school.[23] These approaches to research follow the pattern of science–description, explanation, prediction–and promise fruitful results.

Adequacy of Research.

Just how adequate an effort are we making in research in educational administration? Are we doing enough research? Is the quality at a high enough level? Is what we call research really research? These are the questions to which we will address ourselves in this section.

---

[20] See Andrew Halpin, *Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents*. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1956, pp. 85, 86.

[21] Hemphill, Griffiths, and Frederiksen, *Administrative Performance and Personality*. New York: Teachers College Bureau of Publications, 1962.

[22] Daniel E. Griffiths, Samuel Goldman, Wayne J. McFarland, "Teacher Mobility in New York City," accepted for publication in *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Winter 1965.

[23] Daniel E. Griffiths, et al; *Organizing Schools for Effective Education*. Danville: Interstate Press, 1962.

Mark Atwood, "Small-scale Administrative Change: Resistance to the Introduction of a High School Guidance Program," in Mathew Miles (ed.), *Innovation in Education*. New York: Teachers College Bureau of Publications, 1963, pp. 49-77.

Quantity of research. It is often said that there is a vast amount of research in educational administration. Accordingly one would think that there is a veritable flood of research reports gushing forth from the universities each year. How true is this commonly held notion?

It is difficult to determine the number of researches undertaken in a given period of time, but an approximation can be made of both published and unpublished research. Two isues of the *Review of Educational Research*, one on "Teacher Personnel" and one on "Educational Organization, Administration, and Finance" are devoted exclusively to reporting published research bearing on educational administration. The reviewers are given no bounds on the journals or books on which they report so we can get a fairly good approximation of the total number of researches which have implications for educational administration. In the three-year period ending October 1958, a total of 971 published researches were reviewed. These are published reports and so give no inkling of the unpublished researches. To determine the volume of unpublished research, *Dissertation Abstracts* and *Research Studies in America* were consulted. This analysis revealed a total of 322 unpublished in 1956, 213 in 1957 and an estimated 275 in 1958. The total volume of research—published and unpublished—bearing on educational administration for the three-year period, 1956-58, comes to 1,781—an average of 594 researches a year. This gives us an indication of the volume of research relating to educational administration. Is the number sufficient?

One way to answer this is to compare the number with other standard fields of inquiry. It is fully realized that chemistry, for instance, and educational administration are not comparable, but some indication of the way research is considered in each could be gained by a comparison. A search of *Chemical Abstracts* revealed that 105,000 studies were abstracted in 1956; 112,000 in 1957; and 127,000 in 1958. A study of *Psychological Abstracts* indicated that 8,541 studies were abstracted in 1956; 9,074 in 1957; and 6,100 in the first ten months of 1958. A comparison of the number of researches in psychology, chemistry, and educational administration reveals the following figures:

	1956	1957	1958
Educational Administration	594[a]	594[a]	594[a]
Psychology	8,541	9,074	6,100[b]
Chemistry	105,000	112,000	127,000

[a] Average number of studies in 3 years (total 1,781).

[b] Ten months.

When one considers that the research reported in the *Review* is not screened for quality and, in fact, much is not research even under the loosest of definitions, the number of researches comparable in quality to those in *Chemical Abstracts* becomes very small. On this score Michael point out, "Probably, on the average, only 10 per cent of the published papers in educational journals are worthy of being reported in the *Review*." Later in the same article he says, "In the writer's estimation, slightly more than 55 per cent of the entries in the bibliographies could have been deleted without any noticeable depreciation in the value of the current issue. This is based upon a careful examination of the contents of approximately 87 per cent of the references cited."[24]

When one views the initial figure and diminishes it by a conservative figure of, say, 75 per cent, the only conclusion one can reach is that the veritable flood is a dubious dribble.

Content of research. It is more revealing to look at what is studied than it is merely to ask how much is studied. What problems are being studied? Are we doing the same old studies over and over again each year, adding nothing to the sum total of knowledge, or are we using what we know of past research and thereby making each new study a pioneering endeavor? Evidence suggests that we have stayed too long in the same old rut. As an example, consider research on boards of education.

In a review of studies on boards of education, Charters found that there have been, since 1904, some seventy-five studies of the characteristics of board members. His conclusion is pertinent:

> We have reached the point at which additional surveys add nothing to our understanding of educational problems. To add more information of the same sort to the vast accumulation of surveys already at hand is a misdirection of research effort. The pressing problems of education call for research which explains how our schools and school boards function; the time for descriptions of the status of board members has passed.[25]

Charters was overly generous in his statement that the time for description of the status of board members has passed. New studies have actually failed to have any significance since Count's monumental study of the composition of boards of education published in 1927.[26] Aside from an occasional check, such as was done by Brown[27] in 1954, there is no need to bombard captive board members with questionnaires asking how they earn their living. Far more significant questions should be asked, such as:

---

[24] Michaels, op. cit., pp. 443, 444.

[25] W. W. Charters, Jr., "Beyond the Survey in School Board Research," *Educational Administration and Supervision*, Vol. 41 (December 1955), pp. 449-452.

[26] George Counts, *The Social Composition of Boards of Education*. Supplementary Educational Monographs, No. 23. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927.

[27] Robert H. Brown, "The Composition of School Boards," *American School Board Journal*, Vol. 129 (August 1954), pp. 23-24.

1. How do school boards reach decisions?

2. What do differences in social status among members of boards of education mean in terms of the decisions boards make? For example: Do doctors vote the same as lawyers? Do representatives of labor have opinions on educational issues which differ from representatives of the managerial class?

3. Do boards legislate policy and superintendents administer policy, or is this an outmoded educational myth?

4. Why do citizens seek or accept appointment to boards of education?

5. What are the criteria by which the effectiveness of a board of education may be judged?

A major weakness of research in educational administration appears to be a belaboring of the obvious and a careful mining of the superficial. Too often it appears that the criterion of feasibility is the only one applied to determine whether or not a study is undertaken. Feasibility must always be a limiting factor on research, but scholars in educational administration should cease behaving like the intoxicated gentleman who searched under the street lamp for the keys which he had dropped in the alley, because it was dark where he dropped them. They should strive to discard the strait jacket of feasibility.

An analysis of the 47 projects approved by the CRB is contained in Table IV. The two topics most popular are school finance and administrative performance. The latter indicates a change in research emphasis in the past 10 years, while finance remains at the top where it has been for perhaps 40 years.

School finance is still, in my opinion, the topic with the most sophisticated literature and the best research. I have considerable doubt as to the significance of the research, but that it is well done cannot be doubted. The number of studies in decision-making also marks a new trend, since there were practically no such studies 10 years ago. Considered as content, the research now supported by CRB is encouraging. The topics are more significant than previously and many areas are being explored. However, the number of studies is discouragingly low. The two studies in Personnel should be 100. When few studies are done, topics are researched superficially. This is the major difference between fields like chemistry and educational administration.

Research That Is Not Research.

There are three major aspects to this topic: (1) quality; (2) policy research; and (3) action research. These are three quite different aspects and they deal with completely different kinds of research.

Table IV
TOPICS RESEARCHED BY YEAR
COOPERATIVE RESEARCH BRANCH

	No.	%
Finance		
341, 803, 1045, 1241, 1495, 1816, 1828, 1853, 2123, 2389, 2538, 2557	12	25.5
Administrative Performance		
214, 714, 853, 975, 1329, 2371, 2394, 2536, 2633, Taxonomy, E-1	11	23.4
Decision-Making		
1324, 1568, 1765, 1913, 2440, G-007	6	12.8
District Reorganization		
375, 1044, 1318	3	6.4
Perception		
532, 543, 929	3	6.4
Community Reaction to Education		
308, 668	2	4.3
School Law		
1275, 1359	2	4.3
Selection of Administration		
677, 1076	2	4.3
Personnel		
1934, 2637	2	4.3
Scheduling		
1323	1	2.1
Miscellaneous		
G-02, E-031, F-2	3	6.4
	47	100.2

The second and third are both worthy types of endeavors, but are not research as defined above.

Quality. This is difficult to discuss because there are no clearly defined standards which a research project should meet. Several aspects of the quality problem have been discussed elsewhere, so that we need not discuss them here. Some evidence on the quality problem, however, may be gleaned from the fact that in the past six years the reviewers who wrote the articles on the general topic of administrative theory in the *Review of Educational Research* concluded that only one-fourth of the references surveyed were acceptable as research works.[28] Many of the articles included met only a minimum standard.

---

[28] Daniel E. Griffiths and Laurence Iannaccone, "Administrative Theory, Relationships, and Preparation," in "Education Organization, Administration, and Finance," *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 28, No. 4 (October 1958), p. 334.

Policy research. One of the practices which is most damaging to the reputation of administrative research is engaged in by a large number of professional organizations, state education departments, and school systems. This is the practice of subordinating research to policy development. What happens is this: an organization, say a state education association, is confronted with a problem such as the legislature considering a bill advocating compulsory merit rating for teachers. The association, through its board of directors, publicly goes on record as opposing the bill while indicating that their research division will "study" the problem. What they actually mean is that their research division will dig up the evidence to support their stand.

It should be obvious that this sort of practice cannot be continued if research is to command a position of respectability in the educational world. Two steps must be taken if respectibility is to be attained. The first step is that administrators must be convinced that research should take place *before* policies are formulated, not afterward, and the second step is that researchers must be taught not to prostitute their labors to the whims of their administrators. Neither of these steps can be attained easily, but attained they must be or administrative research will continue to have little value in the actual administration of organizations.

Action research. One of the recent developments in education has been the introduction of an idea called "action research." The idea originated in the acknowledgement of the fact that educational research had failed to play a significant role in changing educational practice. The remedy for this was to propose that the personnel doing research be changed and that classroom teachers be involved more directly in research. Many have considered action resarch to be a new research methodology, perhaps unique to the field of education. After a period of trial it now appears that action research is not research at all. It seems as though it should be considered as a method of in-service training of teachers rather than an activity which accomplishes what is generally called research.

In a discussion of this topic, Corman discussed the question of whether action research was a new methodology of research or a method of in-service training and concluded:

> If we require, as a minimum condition, that a new methodology or technique give us a new way of organizing or analyzing phenomena so as to lead to the generation and test of new hypotheses or to fresh ways of testing old ones, it is questionable if any of the features central in the thinking of the action researchers make much of a contribution to research methodology (however great a contribution they do make to the in-service education of teachers).[29]

---

[29] Bernard R. Corman, "Action Research: A Teaching or a Research Method?" in "Methodology of Educational Research," *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 27, No. 5 (December 1957), p. 544.

Uses of Previous Research.

For one who has worked with many doctoral students, it is almost possible to predict with certainty that in an early conference the student will say of his topic, "No one else has ever studied this topic!" It is almost as certain that a frighteningly large number of studies has been done on the topic. This was pointed out by Ramey, who reviewed the research in the selection of administrators.[30] He found that as late as 1954 a doctoral dissertation at a leading Eastern university was written on administrator selection without a single reference to the seventy-five studies which preceded it. Needless to say, the study duplicated numerous researches done earlier without adding to the reliability of the earlier studies. The tendency of so many researchers to begin their research *de novo* is both distressing in its naivete and wasteful in its use of the researchers' time. No wonder it is difficult to discern trends in research in educational administration when so many are researching in total ignorance of the fact that others have worked in the same area.

To document this point further we should recall that the 1920's were a time of high productivity for research in school buildings and equipment. One might almost characterize this as the forgotten age of administrative research since no one now even looks at studies of that period. During that period Packer developed an instrument to be used in computing the number and type of rooms needed in a secondary school.[31] In 1954, there was developed the Castoldi Nomogram, an instrument designed to do exactly the same job.[32] The one big difference is that it is more difficult to use!

The other side of the coin, and equally a problem, is the tendency of many to use previous research in an uncritical, unquestioning manner. Ramey found this too, in his work on the selection of administrators. Tracing the studies in this field from 1839 to 1957, he found that the research went in circles. Usually the circle started with a speech in which the qualities for which administrators should be selected were delineated, then an article would be written on the speech, then the article would get into a textbook, and then a "researcher" would compile a questionnaire based on the qualities in the textbook, and sure enough the results would then appear in a speech and the circle would begin again. The same qualities mentioned in

---

[30] James W. Ramey, *A Review of School Administrator Selection Research.* Unpublished Doctor of Education Project. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1958, Type C Project.

[31] Paul C. Packer, *Housing of High School Programs.* Contributions to Education, No. 159. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1924.

[32] *The Castoldi Nomogram.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: New England School Development Council, 1954.

1955 were mentioned in 1839! Both procedures are equally unproductive and equally to be condemned.

The proper use of previous research should be a matter for serious concern at the present moment. There is not time for each of us to do whatever project our whims encourage; neither is the research done previously of such a high quality that one can adopt its conclusions and implications on faith alone. Each research project that is undertaken should commence with a critical review of the pertinent research that has preceded it.

Lack of summaries of research. The failure to utilize the little quality research available in a discriminating and productive manner is, at least in part, due to the lack of summaries of research in our field.

With the small amount of research that is completed it is rather disappointing that so little is done with it. One of the outstanding lacks is the absence of comprehensive reviews of research in particular areas such as morale, school buildings, and organization. It is true that the *Review of Educational Research* does publish a three-year review of certain broad areas and that these serve a fine purpose. The *Review*, however, is neither lengthy enough nor comprehensive enough to serve the purpose suggested here.

In addition the *Review* must depend on volunteer labor which, while occasionally productive of a fine piece of work, often results in a superficial article by a graduate student or a casual stint of cacography by a professor.

If you are an administrator who wants to know the latest research on morale, if you are one of the handful of professors who wishes to base his lecture on research, or if you are a writer wishing to base a textbook on the research in administration, you find yourself digging out the research bit by bit. There should be available comprehensive reviews of the literature of research which could be used by such people. Comprehensive reviews are available in other fields, as for example Rossi's review[33] of the literature of decision-making in communities, and Edwards' review of 209 studies of decision-making.[34] Such summaries of the research can have tremendous influence if they are well done, as witness the distinguished survey of leadership literature by Stogdill.[35] This study was the single most important factor in swinging research in leadership away from the trait approach. It demonstrates the great value in "research done on research." In his, Stogdill had to build a conceptual framework of analyzing and evaluating 124 studies of leadership. His work resulted in the oft-quoted conclusion that:

---

[33] Peter N. Rossi, "Community Decision Making," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 1, No. 4 (March 1957), pp. 415-443.

[34] Ward Edwards, "Theory of Decision Making," *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 51 (1954), pp. 380-417.

[35] Ralph M. Stogdill, "Personal Factors Associated with Leadership," *The Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 25 (1948), pp. 35-71.

> The findings suggest that leadership is not a matter of passive status, or of the mere possession of some combination of traits. It appears rather to be a working relationship among members of a group, in which the leader acquires status through active participation and demonstration of his capacity for carrying cooperative tasks through to completion.[36]

Reviews or surveys of research are badly needed in educational administration. We should attack and publish surveys of each. It is of interest to note that all three studies mentioned above were supported by foundation grants. We, too, should move in this direction.

Sequential Research. In the process of bringing about a change in an organization or in a product a sequence that is firmly rooted in research is normally followed. The sequence begins with what is called basic research, proceeds through a development stage, and terminates in a period of field testing. Thus, basic research might indicate that certain types of plants can be destroyed by certain chemicals. A weed killer is then developed and tested. If it appears to be satisfactory it is then sent to a large number of farmers who use it under field conditions. However, county agents observe the use of the weed killer to see if it can be safely and profitably used under field conditions by farmers who are not scientists. This process is lengthy and time consuming, yet is considered to be absolutely necessary.

We seem to feel no need for this procedure in educational administration. Ideas spring from the innovator's mind into direct application to children and teachers with no intermediate steps. If medicine did things the way we do, the Salk vaccine would have been administered to everyone merely because Jonas Salk thought it should be, and was persuasive enough to get us to do it. The Cooperative Research Program has money to support the field tryout of experimental results, yet has not had the opportunity to make a single grant for this purpose.

We in educational administration need to distinguish between basic research, development, and field tryouts. We should adopt the point of view that ideas should not be tried on children until there is some large amount of evidence that the ideas are workable and the results will be beneficial.

---

[36] Ibid., p. 66.

3

The Sociology of Educational Administration

By
BURTON R. CLARK

The Sociology of Educational Administration

BURTON R. CLARK
Center for the Study of Higher Education
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, Berkeley

THE SOCIOLOGY of educational administration is variously related. It is first of all a part of the sociology of education. It is also a part of or closely related to complex organization, where educational agencies are part of the subject matter of comparative organizational study; the analysis of influence, where influence on educational decision-making is compared with influence in other institutional webs and in the general political arenas of society; community analysis, where the effects of the social structures and normative systems of towns and cities on public policy include the effects on educational policy. The sociology of educational administration also connects to role analysis, sub-culture analysis, and small group analysis; in short, name a line of work in sociology and one can in short order identify connections between it and the subject at hand. There are no boundaries around a sociology of educational administration, but rather open terrain and rambling roads that connect to the interests of researchers in a number of other specialities in sociology, and the interests of psychologists, anthropologists, economists and political scientists. There is also extensive overlap with the conventional wisdom of the experienced and thoughtful educational administrator and even, on occasion, some convergence with good common sense.

MAJOR CONCERNS OF THE SOCIOLOGY OF EDUCATION

I will not try to locate the sociology of educational administration in all of the many webs of concern in which it is embedded or implicated or somehow connected. It would be fruitless to diagram all those relatives in a kinship chart. I would like, however, to place this field briefly in the sociology of education, to help us sense the degree of relevance of different research topics.

The broadest sector of inquiry lies in the connection of education to the external social structure: to other major institutions (the economy, the political system); to the class and racial-ethnic patterns that define the system of social stratification; to the intersecting groups of family, neighborhood and age peer that help to define the educability of the young; to such relatively unorganized forms of social participation that we denote with such primitive terms as leisure, entertainment, and recreation. The many significant lines of inquiry here quickly carry us across the imagined boundaries between sociology and political science, economics, social psychology, and demography.

The Educational Institution.

The sociology of education, secondly, concerns itself with matters internal to education but outside the particular school or college; that is, with the educational institution taken as a whole, or with major segments larger than the individual school or college. Considered as a social institution, education is, among other things, a web of organizations and associations, a network characterized in modern society by a growing division of tasks that both differentiates organizations and knits them together in interlocking functions, and hence in interlocking dependencies. Taken whole, education is also a labor force, an occupation, a segment of the world of work in which the phenomena of recruitment, job status, occupational orientation, mobility, and career affect the educational process and the capacity of the school and colleges to perform certain social and cultural tasks.

The Educational Organization.

A third center of attention in the sociology of education, one now developing rapidly, is the internal life of the educational organization. The school or college is (a) a formal organization, with bureaucratic and professional features; (b) a sub-culture, or a set of interrelated sub-cultures of students and faculty; and (c) a series of interactions of teachers and students centered on the formal instruction of the classroom. Within the organization as a whole, or the sub culture, or the classroom, socially emergent patterns as well as planned relations condition the educational process. In turn, educational practices affect the value orientations and social structure of the school and help to determine the social fate of individuals and segments of the population.

Educational Sub-systems of Other Institutions.

For a fourth sector, sociological inquiry needs to define and comprehend education outside of Education, especially that which emerges as sizeable organized components of other major institutions. The growth and spread of educational work is leading to substantial educational sub-systems in the military and in business as well as in the church. The future promises great spread of formal instruction outside of the regular line of schools and colleges, and a grasp of the common and uncommon functions of these education sub-systems would measurably extend our understanding of the changing roles of education in the social structure.

Thus we have four sectors of concern in the sociology of education: education and society, the educational institution, the educational organization, and the educational sub-systems of other institutions. These analytical distinctions are not categories for containing research, for inquiry will normally spill over their boundaries. To analyze features of school organization, we often consider their environmental determinants; to comprehend interpersonal relations in the classroom, we may need to consider the articulation of the school with the labor force. These categories serve simply to delineate major areas of relation of education to social structure and to suggest the scope and promise of a more developed sociology of education.

Now where does the sociology of educational administration fit in, among and within these broad sectors of concern about education? In some degree, it fits almost everywhere. It hardly needs mentioning that class and race bear heavily on the educational process and that study of class and race is relevant to the study of educational administration—and, vice versa, since the bureaucratization of the school means that administrative processes, such as counseling, help to determine the mobility of the young and their location as adults in the social structure. Relevance is everywhere, from the broadest connections of education to the general culture to the specific processes of teacher-student interaction in the classroom, relevance for the understanding of educational organization and for the effective action of the educational administrator. Perhaps this is to say no more than that educational administration is applied social science, and hence any inquiry in basic social science is potentially grist for the mill.

But relevance varies greatly in degree, and we must make some choices about topics and lines of work that can be usefully approached and developed by those who are equipped with sociological perspectives, and that can also be expected to have fairly direct relation to the practice of educational administration. Two broad areas seem particularly important; both directly involve educational organization as the focus of study. One is intra-organization, and is part of one of the four major sectors of the sociology of education that I specified above; that is, the study of the educational agency itself as a social structure, as a social system. The second is inter-organization, and is a part of the major sector specified above as the educational institution, what goes on in education in the larger systems of which the separate school or college is a part.

STUDY OF INTRA-ORGANIZATION

When we look at the school or college as a formal organization, we find a number of important structural features that affect policy and administration, and which have been or ought to be studied by sociologists. I will review briefly four features: organizational place, specialization of roles, authority, bureaucratization.

Organizational Place.

The particular place in the general institutional web that is allotted to, seized by, or accidentally found by a school or college is an important but generally overlooked determinant of its character, often having decisive effect on the status of the organization and its members. A school is judged and rated by public perception of its main task or tasks, which have high or low status according primarily to their connection with occupations and social status. Among the specialized schools of English secondary education, the grammar school leads to the university and high status occupations and is assigned high status, while the secondary modern school, for the most part, does not lead to the lofty places and is generally awarded lower status.[1] The staff and the students in the modern school labor under the stigma of the lower status, stimulating concern about how to achieve a parity of esteem for schools performing different educational and social tasks. The realization that this is virtually impossible lends support to the effort to group the secondary "streams" within comprehensive schools somewhat similar to the American form.

The resources—money, staff, students—available to a school or college are heavily influenced by its place within education and society. The social hierarchy of the major types of English secondary schools affects recruitment—the proportion of teachers from middle class homes increases, and the proportion from working class homes decreases, as one moves from the lower to the higher status schools.[2] In the United States, there is a noticeable self-selection of students to

---

[1] Olive Banks, *Parity and Prestige in English Secondary Education*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1954.

[2] Jean Floud and W. Scott, "Recruitment to Teaching in England and Wales," in A. H. Halsey, Jean Floud and C. Arnold Anderson (eds.), *Education, Economy and Society*. New York: Free Press, 1961, pp. 527-544.

Ivy League colleges because of their high status and the belief, based on fact,[3] that these colleges promote allocation to high positions. The geographical location of a school or college can in itself be decisive, as the introductory pages of college catalogs have long recognized in their glowing prose about rural charm and urban convenience. To place a college in the American South is to intensify greatly the problems of staff recruitment, since for reasons of racial problems and anti-intellectual climate all other regions of the country are preferred by Ph.D. candidates, and a large proportion of advanced graduate students will not consider any college in five of the Southern states.[4]

Such examples make the point that the analysis of the organization and the administration of a school or college must frequently begin with an understanding of its location in organizational space and its specific social and cultural functions as these are perceived and defined by other educators and the public. Organizational place is a fundamental organizational characteristic, one that heavily conditions administration. It is a characteristic easily overlooked however, in many forms of administrative analysis, and those with a sociological imagination should help draw attention to it. Actual and perceived location among other organizations becomes increasingly important as schools and colleges grow in number and variety.

Specialization of Primary Work Roles.

With eduational work evermore various and complex, the school or college does not escape the growing specialization found elsewhere in modern social organization, but rather becomes more of a system for coordinating a growing array of unlike specialities. Expanding knowledge militates sharply against efforts to maintain educational work in an undifferentiated state. Academic disciplines proliferate and professors specialize in and within disciplines, fragmenting the campus and deepening the problems of communication and coordination. The teacher in the elementary and secondary school is less affected by the intense specialization that occurs along the edges of advanced knowledge, but he also moves toward specialization in subject matter and grade level. The teacher who could handle all subjects for six to eight grades in the small school house has been rendered incompetent, and the changes underway in the 1960's in the curriculum of the elementary school (e.g. foreign language instruction, new mathematical and scientific materials) accelerate the trend toward specialization that has replaced the old school marm with teachers who lean to a particular strength and prefer only a small part of the action. The internal array of specialties is also widened by expertise in administration, as to the old duties of the line are added such tasks as purchasing, budget control, public relations, counseling and student activities.

---

[3] Ernest Havemann and Patricia Salter West, *They Went to College*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1952.

[4] Russell Middleton, "Racial Problems and the Recruitment of Academic Staff, Southern Colleges and Universities," *American Sociological Review*, 26, 1961, pp. 960-970.

When new duties are added to the work of a school or college, they may be located in newly differentiated roles or added to the traditional ones. One interpretation of the modern American university professor, congruent with the feeling of distraction and overwork common among academics, holds that his position of work is undergoing considerable strain because new tasks have been added on top of the old: "the academic role has been gradually redefined to embrace the variety of diverse tasks that the university has assumed."[5] To undergraduate teaching and advising, academia has added graduate teaching, research, consulting, and extensive committee work. This formulation calls attention to the burdens of new and expanded tasks, but we need also consider what duties and expectations have been lifted from the professor and what tasks upon being added to the modern university have been assigned to other roles. In the nineteenth century college, the professor spent himself in student discipline: "Faculty members and administrators in virtually all American colleges spent almost as much time trying to cope with the behavior of the adolescents entrusted to them as with their studies."[6] The little hellions were to be supervised from morning to evening, including the overseeing of prayers, rendering the old-time professor the regulator of student conduct virtually around the clock—and the object of student rebellion. There is little wonder that in the transformation of American colleges from single to multi-purpose organizations the American professor has been willing to allow the supervision of student behavior to be detached from his role and placed in the hands of deans and other student personnel officials. The burdens of student counseling have also been increasingly added and assigned to an Administration separated from teaching and itself internally differentiated.

Thus we can offer an alternative interpretation to the hypothesis of the inclusive role: the proliferation of work activities in education, as elsewhere induces a differentiation of roles. The professional role has shed major tasks as others have been added. The role itself is also currently undergoing extensive "internal" differentiation, with a string of roles appearing in the guise of one. Some professors only teach, particularly in small four-year colleges and junior colleges; some teach and serve as part-time counselors; some teach and do research and consult; some only do research; some in professional schools are nearly full-time consultants. These patterns are structural adjustments to task diversity. Such role differentiation in its early stages develops without much formal recognition in titles and status ladders. That the formal will follow to codify the emergent is now exemplified by the case of academics in university laboratories and institutes whose differentiated work is leading to titles, salary scales, and career ladders distinguishable from that of their fellows in the departments.

---

[5] Neal Gross, "Organizational Lag in American Universities," *Harvard Educational Review*, 33, 1963, pp. 58-73.

[6] George F. Schmidt, *The Liberal Arts College*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1957, p. 76.

Role analysis has only begun to scratch the surface of the phenomena of role expansion, role loss, role split, and role differentiation in educational organization. Sophisticated analysis, especially with historical perspective, of the changes taking place in the key roles of the school and college would measurably inform the practice of educational administration. Role analysis has been used to identify conflicting perceptions, as in the case of differences between teachers, board members, and superintendents on the role of superintendent.[7] When focused on the tasks of a position, role analysis is also an excellent way of locating structural sources of stress, stress that systematically affects morale and systematically presses for informal adaptation and unplanned change. The sociological imagination is particularly tuned to this form of analysis.

Distribution of Authority.

The exercise of authority takes radically different forms in American schools and colleges, with the critical divide lying between the college and the lower schools. I will consider briefly each of these two major levels.

Authority in Higher Education. In higher education, the increased specialization of work and differentiation of roles extend the need for bureaucratic coordination, and there is a pronounced trend toward formal codification of rules, accompanied by a weaker trend toward the fixing of responsibility in a higher and wider hierarchy of administrative positions. Rule-making proceeds at a rapid rate as faculties and administrators seek to apply universalistic criteria across large, complex staffs. But the attempt to fix authority in a single structure within which salaried experts are accountable to superiors is countered and somewhat contained by the authority of the faculty.

With its origins in the self-rule of the teacher and student guilds that comprised the medieval university, faculty authority historically has been collegial, hence anti-bureaucratic, in form. Faculty authority is now evolving away from its traditional collegial form, under the impact of modern expertise and the growing size and complexity of the campus, but the form to which it tends is also largely anti-bureaucratic. As the campus moves from characteristics of community to characteristics of loosely-joined federation, faculty authority moves from the meeting of the assembled faculty and the informal interaction of a small body to the numerous, dispersed units (departments, sub-schools, sub-colleges) that are the foci of the disciplinary interests of the faculty, and to a more formal representative government in which there is greater differentiation between those who participate and those who do not.[8]

---

[7] Neal Gross, Ward S. Mason, and A. W. McEachern, *Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency Role*. New York: Wiley, 1958.

Faculty authority tends toward an authority whose main function is to protect the autonomy of experts—similar to the function of professionalism in other organizations. A growing literature depicts the clash of bureaucratic and professional authority in the modern large-scale organization.[9] The faculty man is a professional in the sense of the specialized expert whose competence has considerable intellectual content and who has a strong commitment to a career based on his special competence;[10] and academic man occupies a role that has much in common with the position of other experts in other organizations, particularly the scientist in industry and the physician in the hospital where the demands for personal and group autonomy are high.

Modern faculty control is different from professional authority in other places; however, in its extensive fragmentation, its tendency is to group around the interests of a large variety of groups of roughly equal status and power. The experts—chemists, linguists, historians, professors of marketing—identify with their separate disciplines and the over-all academic profession comes off a poor second. As an organization of professionals, the campus is decentralized and multiple, rather than a close-knit group who see the world from one perspective. In short, faculty authority tends toward professional authority in federated form. The combination of professionalism and loosely-joined structure functions to protect the autonomy of the work of experts amidst extensive divergence of interest and commitment.

---

[8] Burton R. Clark, "Faculty Organization and Authority," in *The Study of Academic Administration*. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1963, pp. 37-51.

[9] Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, *Formal Organizations*. San Francisco: Chandler, 1962; Theodore Caplow and Reece J. McGee, *The Academic Marketplace*. New York: Basic Books, 1958; Burton R. Clark, "Faculty Authority," *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors*. 47, 1961, pp. 293-302; Alvin W. Gouldner, "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles." Parts I and II, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2, 1957, 1958, pp. 281-306, 444-480; Morris Janowitz, *The Professional Soldier*. New York: Free Press, 1960; William Kornhauser, *Scientists in Industry: Conflict and Accommodation*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1962; Simon Marcson, *The Scientist in American Industry*. New York: Harper, 1960; Logan Wilson, *The Academic Man*. London: Oxford Press, 1942.

[10] Kornhauser, *op. cit.*

Bureaucratization and professionalization in modern higher education both stem from the same basic trends in the relation of education to society. A widening array of educational tasks for an expanding population leads to increase in size, complexity, and internal specialization in educational organizations. With higher education's commitment to research and scholarship—the frontiers of knowledge—the increased specialization takes the form, in large part, of intense pursuit of specialized knowledge. The need for personal and group autonomy grows, and there is a pronounced move toward professionalism, with authority based on technical knowledge and located in the individual expert and semi-autonomous clusters of experts. At the same time, the differentiation and proliferation deepens the need for administrative coordination and the campus moves toward some bureaucratic arrangements. The modern campus is too large and complicated for professional or collegial direction to provide the over-all coordination, and this task is performed largely by bureaucracy. But bureaucracy cannot provide or protect well the exercise of judgment by diverse experts, and this task is performed largely by a federated professionalism.

With academic disciplines and professional fields constituting the natural bases of academic federalism, the academic tasks that move toward marginal status are either those that cut across disciplines and require attention, commitment and consensus from the faculty as a whole, (e.g., general education) or are little rewarded in the career patterns of the separate fields (e.g., undergraduate teaching). General education for the undergraduate stands in double jeopardy, and general educationists have sought to reverse this situation by utilizing the principle of federated structure for their own ends—by organizing the campus in the form of a federation of small colleges and residential houses organized around undergraduates.

Authority in Elementary and Secondary Education. In elementary and secondary education in the United States the authority structure takes a markedly different form from that just described. There is less expertise, less impulse toward federated professionalism protective of teacher autonomy. The public school systems are more characterized by a vulnerable bureaucracy. The authority structure of the school takes the form of a single hierarchy, rather than of the dual and multiple governments of the college, with teachers as employees under supervision of administrators. The critical feature of this authority is its amenability to external control. Vulnerability stems in part from the decentralization of control to local lay boards, with job security of administrators closely dependent on lay approval. The vulnerability is extended by the correlated ideology of local lay control that has been a sacred component of the American conception of educational governance. In addition, the ideologies of the public school administration have adjusted to this vulnerability, with administration often guided by conceptions of *service* to lay demands and *efficient* operation of the schools in line with community dictates.[11]

The vulnerability does not mean total dependence on lay interests, since many matters are shielded from public view or only dimly perceived, and others are so latent that even school personnel are not aware of them. Increasing size and complexity has masking effects, and school personnel work out some defenses against external demand.[12] But on issues of major concern to laymen, the American school administrator is highly vulnerable to external pressure, compared with his counterpart in the democratic industrialized societies of Europe, where educators are protected by centralization, close ties to the educated elites, and an accepted posture of superior judgment.

There are so many cross-currents in the redistribution of authority within schools and colleges, however, that only sustained and diversified inquiry will provide a balanced account that will help inform the theory and practice of educational administration. Some public school systems are not vulnerable bureaucracies, but are directed by relatively autonomous staffs. Professional protection and union protection of the teaching force are both making headway, reducing the influence of lay demands and lay control.

Bureaucratization.

The bureaucratization of the school is a general phenomenon that has significant bearing on social mobility. Bureaucratization increases the weight of the formal apparatus of education in determining the futures of the young; it renders careers more dependent on classificatory and treatment processes of the school.[13] A modern school system initiates a dossier on the student in the lower grades, adds information to the file from time to time, and passes the records along through channels as the student moves to the next step in the organizational treatment. The file provides the information which officials interpret to classify the student as an academic-social type, and from the classification follows efforts to assign students to different treatments.

---

[11] Raymond E. Callahan, *Education and the Cult of Efficiency*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962; Burton R. Clark, *Adult Education in Transition: A Study of Institutional Insecurity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1956; Myron Lieberman, *Education as a Profession*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1956.

[12] Cf. Howard S. Becker, "The Teacher in the Authority System of the Public Schools." *Journal of Educational Sociology*, 27, 1953, pp. 128-141.

[13] Aaron V. Cicourel and John I. Kitsuse, *The Educational Decision-Makers*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1963; Burton R. Clark, *The Open Door College*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960; David A. Goslin, *The Search For Ability: Standardized Testing in Social Perspective*. New York: Russell Sage, 1963; H. Schelsky, "Family and School in Modern Society," in Halsey, Floud and Anderson, *op. cit.*, pp. 414-420; Patricia C. Sexton, *Education and Income*. New York: Viking Press, 1961.

The typing process increasingly runs through the office of an official, the counselor, who specializes in student classification: Is the student to be defined as bright, average, dull, overachiever, normal achiever, underachiever, well-adjusted, neurotic, a good boy, a hood? Given the nature of his case, what careers are possible and what courses and class assignments are therefore appropriate? The criteria of classification are shaky and often differentially interpreted and applied. But increasing specialization among occupations and longer formal instruction make hit-and-miss and late identification of capability seem more costly for both the individual and the society.

The effort to locate and train talent in order to enhance the manpower of a nation also adds to the pressures to develop and apply methods for identifying the attributes of students, measuring their progress, and steering if not controlling their choices. In secondary and higher education, the counselor needs an apparatus of records, grades, and interviews to cool out or gracefully demote the student whose aspirations are markedly out of line with ability. The within-school selection characteristic of mass democratic systems of advanced education is heavily dependent on bureaucratization.

In short, modern trends in the organization of schools and colleges have the broad social consequence of partially bureaucratizing and rationalizing the processes of social mobility. Parental and student orientations must interact with the increasingly more systematized institutional means of achievement. Their orientations are sometimes defined, sometimes redefined, and always processed by the every-day activities of a school bureaucracy. These activities differentiate and distribute the student population among major lines of future career development.[14]

Thus the growing size and complexity and expertise of educational work has subtle and potentially staggering implications for the destinies of the young. Sociological research should help draw out these implications of the internal administrative arrangements of the school and college; and, in so doing, help the practicing administrator to become more sensitive to the long-run unanticipated and often undesired consequences of actions taken with more immediate ends in mind.

I have reviewed four aspects of educational organization—organizational place, specialization of primary work roles, the distribution of authority, bureaucratization—that, as lines of sociological research, have promise for theory and for the informing of administrative practice. These aspects are largely intra-bureaucracy, internal to the school or college. I want now to turn to some features of education that have strong administrative relevance but lie outside the single organization, in inter-organization arrangements.

---

[14] Cicourel and Kitsuse, *op. cit.*

STUDY OF INTER-ORGANIZATION

Those who wish to understand educational administration in the United States will increasingly need to attend, in the coming years, to inter-organizational relations.[15] These relations loom ever larger in administration, as influence and control move upward from local to state levels and as influence, if not control, move still further upward to the national level.

The last decade has seen a sense of nationhood emerge in our thinking about education. The interests in education that have emerged at the national level are strong and lasting in character. They have to do with manpower and unemployment, leadership and creativity, urban and rural renewal, military strength and diplomatic posture, aid to industrializing societies. Compelling in nature, the national interests call out attempts at national programs, and these efforts must find ways of working through the existing decentralized educational structure, or of changing that structure, or of bypassing that structure.

Adjustments and Adaptations Within the Educational System.

As modern social forces recast education as part of the economic and political institutions of society, numerous adjustments and adaptations are bound to occur within the single organization, major segments of the educational system, and the system as a whole. For example, there is a noticeable move toward alliance or federation among private colleges (Great Lakes Association, Associated Colleges of the Midwest, The College Center of the Finger Lakes). The impulse here comes from the maintenance and enhancement needs of existing organizations. Small colleges seek to share expensive facilities and faculties and engage in joint fund-raising, as they compete with the large university. This tendency to band together has in a few years proceeded sufficiently far that officials involved refer to it self-consciously as a movement.[16] The colleges that move toward confederation are attempting to solve organizational problems: how to grow and yet remain small; how to coordinate across a larger pool of activity while protecting the autonomy of constituent units.

---

[15] On interorganizational analysis, see: Sol Levine and Paul E. White, "Exchange and Interorganizational Relationships," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 5 (1961), pp. 583-601; Eugene Litwak and Lydia F. Hylton, "Interorganizational Analysis," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 6 (1962), pp. 395-420; James D. Thompson and William J. McEwen, "Organizational Goals and Environment," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 23 (1958), pp. 23-31.

[16] John J. Wittich (ed.), *College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation*. Corning, N.Y.: College Center of the Finger Lakes, 1962.

Other kinds of adjustment can be found within the single educational organization: adaptation of new technologies; the elaboration and professionalization of public relations, fund-raising, and other boundary roles and activities.

Organizational Influence Patterns.

One particularly interesting pattern is that of the private committee serving as a connector between detached public authorities, notably between federal agencies and local school authorities. The curricular reform movement has adopted this pattern; the prototype was the Physical Science Study Committee, the group of professors and secondary teachers of science, under Professor Zacharias of MIT, who have done so much since 1956 to affect instruction in high school physics.[17] This pattern of influence on education decision-making and practice, as exemplified in the prototype, can be summed up as follows: it was set in motion from the top, by a federal agency (National Science Foundation) and a national private committee (the PSSC) having some of the attributes of an independent and impartial group of reform-minded civic leaders. The purpose of the initiators was to affect grassroots educational practice; the teaching of science, at the time, was defined as a national weakness. The flow of influence is downward, through a chain of independent groups and organizations who find it to their interest to enter the alliance or compact. A federal agency provides the funds; a private non-profit group receives the money and develops a new course; commercial firms carry the new materials to all corners of the existing decentralized structure; dispersed universities and colleges train teachers in all regions of the country to the new materials; existing local authorities adopt the materials and allow their teachers to reshape the local courses.

Decision-making in this pattern, right down the line, is heavily influenced by the prestige of expertise. The National Science Foundation was expert and prestigeful; so also were the Committee, the

---

[17] Paul E. Marsh and Ross A. Gortner, *Federal Aid to Science Education: Two Programs*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1962; Roald F. Campbell and Robert A. Bunnell (eds.), *Nationalizing Influence on Secondary Education*. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, The University of Chicago, 1963; *Innovation and Experiment in Education*, A Progress Report of the Panel on Educational Research and Development to the U.S. Commissioner of Education, The Director of the National Science Foundation, and the Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964; John I. Goodlad, *School Curriculum Reform in the United States*. New York: The Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1964.

Institutes, the teachers trained in the new materials. The very materials themselves traveled under the same aura.

Considering the voluntary character of the participation of each party, especially that of adoption by the local school district, the outcome of this pattern of influence is impressive. The new materials in physics did not hit the field until after 1958. In 1963-64, 40 to 45 per cent of the students taking high school physics in the United States were studying the new materials.[18] Given the educational backwardness of some of the states, some of the rural areas, and some of the slums, it is doubtful if a national ministry with full authority over a national curriculum would have affected a change of greater magnitude in the same period.

This pattern of relatively small private groups serving as connectors between large public organizations is one that, with minor variations, is now in wide use in the curriculum reform movement that is rapidly altering educational practice in the United States. In this pattern, the elements of the internal administration are not the heart of the matter. The pattern is a way of concerting action without bureaucracy. It is one of a class of patterns whose growing importance calls us back to the realization that administrative structure is just one way of consciously concerting action to achieve a purpose.[19]

These patterns, inter-organizational in character, lie somewhat between the ways of concerting action that are commonly found within organizations, hence to be understood by a theory of bureaucracy, and the ways of concerting action that are commonly found in political arenas characterized by a formal decentralization of authority, and which are to be understood by a theory of political influence, such as that which Edward Banfield has so brilliantly attempted to construct in his book *Political Influence*.[20] We need an inter-organizational theory, or a theory of multiple organization. If we were to develop generalizations toward such a theory, we should find many points of contact and overlap with what we know from the study of politics as well as what we know from the study of internal administration. These inter-organizational patterns converge with and become somewhat a part of political influence in that they are the result of efforts to coordinate autonomous agencies, to unite effort *without* the authority of formal hierarchy and employee status.

One way to approach these new patterns is to think of them as in lieu of bureaucracy. This is a necessary approach for comparative analysis of educational influence, since in other countries the study of influence must begin with the fact that there is a national organization of education with important elements of hierarchical and formal control from national ministries to the region, the community, the individual school or college. In other countries, when one says educational organization or educational policy, one thinks of this formal national system. We do not in the United States because we do not have it; but now we are attempting to insert influence from the center without sizeable increase in formal control from the center. Therefore it is fruitful to compare the inter-agency patterns of influence with what we believe to be the normal character of influence intra-agency. I will take several features of bureaucracies and suggest in each case the kind of relation between concerted organizations that approximates the function of that feature.

---

[18] Goodlad, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

[19] Edward C. Banfield, *Political Influence*. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961, passim., particularly Chapter 11.

[20] Ibid.

(1) *Authority and Supervision.* In the bureaucracy, we have an internal delegation of authority, and hence of problems (responsibilities). In inter-organizational patterns, where authority of position is in short supply we have a putting-out of problems by those who have problems but no authority. Problems are farmed out to find competence, to elude the constraints of bureaucracy and the constraints of formal political accountability. Problems are received by cooperating organizations who in seeking their own self interest discover advantage in the relationship.

A corollary of the internal delegation of authority in the bureaucracy is accountability back up the line and supervision by those who occupy positions higher in the line. In the patterns that function in lieu of bureaucracy, accountability and supervision is often provided largely by the contract. Two or more independent organizations voluntarily enter into a federation, bound together over limited time and limited activities by the terms of a contract.[21] Then, in lieu of a superior official who commands and reviews, there exists the stipulations of the contract and legal enforcement.

In short, the contractual putting-out of problems, and hence of domains of work, is a counterpart to authority. It is an organizational invention, or rather an inter-organizational invention, of no slight consequence for a web of organizations where authority is heavily decentralized.

(2) *Work Standards.* In the bureaucracy, from the administrators' code to the standards of the inspectors at the end of the production line, there is explication, formalization, and universal application of standards of work. In inter-organizational patterns, standards setting is usually much less formal and much more indirect. One device is to change the quality of materials available in the market and then pay premiums of prestige, green stamps of prestige, for the use of top

---

[21] On "federalism by contract," see Don K. Price, *Government and Science.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1962; first published by New York University, 1954, Chapter 3.

quality materials. Where the element of prestige behind the top quality is quite strong, say, leading scientists, or leading foundations, or leading public officials, the prestige has a semi-commanding aspect. A second device, where down-the-line authority over field units is lacking, is to construct models of performance and encourage imitation. Prestige here again usually plays a significant part.

(3) *Personnel Assignment and Replacement.* Within the single organization, administrative performance is periodically reviewed and officials are replaced and reassigned to correct weaknesses in the system. In inter-organizational patterns, weak sectors will be attacked in other ways. The authority to reshuffle and replace men is lacking usually; but certain parties to the relationship can pump-prime with resources they do possess–money and often prestige. When men at the center, in federal or private offices, thought they saw a national weakness in the curriculum of the secondary school, they were in no position to order change in state and local personnel. They *were* in a position to use the leverage of money and, as it turned out, the prestige of science to cause local authorities to favor certain kinds of teachers and certain kinds of teaching materials. The influence of money in inter-organizational affairs is a vastly understudied phenomenon. We know, at a minimum, it can lead to voluntary and quite pleasurable seduction.

(4) *Decision-making.* In the bureaucracy, solutions to problems take the form of deliberate central decision. The organization assembles the elements of the problem, alternatives are weighed, and some kind of purposeful or deliberate decision is made. In the patterns of influence that connect autonomous organizations, on the other hand, solutions to problems will be less formally and consciously determined. The solutions move part of the way toward the situation we find in decentralized political systems, where the solution is a "social choice," that is, a resultant of the interaction of interested, autonomous organizations.[22] Influence exerted in a web of autonomous organizations often involves a "decision" that occurs in increments over time. In the pattern of curriculum reform reviewed above, all the interested parties did not come together at one time. Their self-interest was not relevant at every stage. Different parties were involved in the stages of creating new materials, retraining teachers, and putting the new physics into effect in a local school district. There was a rolling federation or alliance; there was a "proposal" for action that was never a unified proposal but one composed of increments determined at different times; there was a "decision" that resulted from the interaction of different parties at different stages.

---

[22] Banfield, *op. cit.*, pp. 326-327.

These parallels I have drawn between bureaucratic and inter-organizational patterns are perhaps sufficient to suggest that there is a vast terrain of action in education where human effort is organized in quasi-formal or quasi-conscious ways, outside of the formal organization and outside of normal political arenas. Modern social forces, in the case of education, are greatly increasing the importance of this no-man's land. The study of educational administration can benefit measurably from the extension of research to this uncharted terrain. We need to bring the view and state systematically the determinants of policy and practice that operate within loosely-jointed sets of organization.

Conclusions

The sociological imagination, along with the imagination of psychologists, economists, political scientists and other social scientists, is moving closer to the astonishing implications of locating much cultural transmission and socialization in a separate major institution called Education. Education in modern society is an awesome institution in size and in the centrality of its tasks, and educational administration is an awesome arena of administration. Too much study of this arena by social scientists is hardly possible; it is increasingly large, diverse, and opaque, with action hidden in bureaucratic shadows and in the intertices of organizational jurisdictions, where formal structure provides no guides.

I have reviewed some of the research done in sociology that is relevant to educational administration, largely under the concepts of role, authority, and bureaucracy. I have also made certain interpretative extensions of that research, and have particularly tried to call attention to an area of "organization" that is not organized and to emergent "administration" that is sufficiently non-formal and elusive that it can readily escape attention. Sociology should be able to make a major contribution to the study of administration within formal structures. It is also notably a discipline whose sensitivity to emergent phenomena and informal patterns should aid greatly in extending the study of educational administration to the many influences on policy and practice that are located outside of formal structures.

This paper is based in part on Burton R. Clark, "Sociology of Education," in Robert E. L. Faris (ed.), *Handbook of Modern Sociology*, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964; and "Social Trends and Educational Organization," paper presented at the 59th Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, Montreal, 1964.

4

The Social Psychology of Educational Administration

By
W. W. CHARTERS, JR.

The Social Psychology of Educational Administration

W. W. CHARTERS, JR.
Graduate Institute of Education
WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

A FEW YEARS ago Professor Gage of Stanford University and I worked together on a book of *Readings in the Social Psychology of Education.* We surveyed literally hundreds of articles and books by educators and behavioral scientists in and around what we took to be the field. It became progressively clearer, as we looked over the literature, that the social psychologist's interest in educational affairs was extremely one-sided. If you make a distinction between research whose relevance is for students and their learning, on the one hand, and research whose relevance is for the adults who inhabit the educational world in other roles than students, it is almost exclusively the former which has attracted social psychological energy. Let me quote from the introduction of our book.

> In the final part of the book we are concerned no longer with influences acting upon the student but rather with those acting upon teachers, administrators, voters, and other adults. Issues in this area have enormous social significance, and social psychological concepts and methods have especial utility for the analysis of these issues. Yet the literature here is far less abundant than that which focuses upon the student.[1]

The last sentence, I must say, is an understatement. The social psychology of education has come to mean the social psychology of student behavior and the classroom group. For a person like me, interested in the social psychological analysis of school-community relations, occupational careers of teachers and administrators, social organization of the public school, school administration, and the like, the term does not fit.

---

[1] W. W. Charters, Jr., and N. L. Gage (Eds.) *Readings in the Social Psychology of Education*, Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1963, p. xxiv.

As a result of the paucity of research in the social psychology of school administration, my comments on the topic must emphasize the prospective rather than the retrospective—promising lines of investigation rather than a review of the present state of knowledge.

THE INTERSECTION BETWEEN INTERESTS

Academic Discipline—School Administration

Lest the title of this paper be misunderstood, let me hasten to say that I do not believe there can be some special discipline known as the social psychology of school administration, or just administration, with concepts and laws of its own. Rather, the title describes the intersection between two sets of interests—the academic discipline of social psychology and the practical operation of administering the schools. I will expand briefly on what I mean by this intersection.

There is, first, the science of social psychology, lying between psychology and sociology and social anthropology. It is just over 50 years old but really a baby of the 20 years following World War II. Roughly, social psychology is the science of the interaction among human beings and of the psychological and collective phenomena which either cause or result from such interaction.

There is, second, a set of activities in American society summarized by the term, administering schools, and an occupational category of persons who pursue these activities. Connected to the occupational category is an array of other societal arrangements for such things as recruiting and training practitioners, for servicing and defending their common interests, and for studying and trying to make more rational the practical activities of administering the schools. This last elaboration of the institutional pattern—a sector whose purpose is to reflect on and investigate school administration and its context—is, of course, epitomized in Oregon's Center for Advanced Study. And it is precisely because there is such a sector that an intersection between the discipline of social psychology and the practical operation of the schools can exist. Those who would study the work of school administration may find it useful to adopt the perspective which may provide a leverage on educational problems which otherwise is unavailable.

The intersection of interests between the discipline of social psychology and the institution of school administration is not one in which an "applied" field exploits the knowledge of a "basic" field and yields nothing in return. Because the terms "basic" and "applied" carry just this connotation, I believe they are inappropriate. The discipline of social psychology depends on contributions to knowledge from many institutional sectors—from the armed forces, industry, adolescent gangs, Alcoholics Anonymous, as well as the contrived laboratory setting. If a theory of resolving role conflict is developed and tested among school superintendents, as in the work of Gross and his colleagues,[2] it contributes to social psychology just as surely as though it had been tested among college sophomores. Many concerns of theoretical social psychology can be pursued readily using data from the adult world of education.

What I want to do in this paper is to describe certain facets of a distinctively social psychological approach to human affairs. I have chosen three aspects of the perspective, recognizing that there are more or that others might choose different ones, and will illustrate each with research conducted on issues of school-community relations, social organization, and teacher personnel. The illustrations come mainly from doctoral studies at Washington University since you may not know of some of them and I can talk about them most easily.

PERSON-TO-PERSON INTERACTION EPISODES

School-Community Relations.

I will first take a case from the area of school-community relations. The social psychologist's perspective would lead us to view the relationship between school and community in fairly concrete terms. One of the pivotal concepts of social psychology is interaction, the interaction between two people. Many wondrous things are said to flow from the process of two people interacting with one another and social psychologists assume that person-to-person interaction is the most important avenue for the transmission of social influence. So one social psychological way of describing the relationship between school and community would be in terms of the nature of the interaction which exists between persons who act in educational roles and persons who are in roles of community inhabitants. How often do parents and teachers or principals and business men see one another in the course of the week, and what do they talk about? Do some teachers see more of one kind of parent than of another kind? How often are interactions initiated by school personnel as compared to people in the community?

Reviewing research in the area, I was rather surprised to find that the simplest kind of descriptive information about school-community contacts had rarely been obtained. Some systematic counts of kinds of school news which appeared in local newspapers had been made, and Florence Greenhoe and Lloyd Cook had collected some crude information in the late 1930's concerning teachers' impressions of their community contacts, but that was about the extent of the research.[3] I encouraged a doctoral candidate, Nolan Correll, to collect systematic data on parent-school interaction in the Illinois farming community in which he was superintendent of schools. He had all school personnel—board members, administrators, secretaries, teachers, custodians, cooks, and school bus drivers—keep regular records on which parents they encountered and the nature of the contacts in the course of several weeks.[4] Some of his findings were extremely revealing.

---

[2] Neal Gross, W. S. Mason, and A. W. McEachern, *Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies in the School Superintendency Role,* New York. Wiley, 1958.

1. There was no dearth of interaction between parents and school personnel. There were over 800 episodes of interaction reported during the period of study; all board, all administrators, 87 per cent of the teachers, and 71 per cent of the service personnel reported contacts with parents. Since the community was small, many of these episodes were chance encounters on the streets and in the businesses or the contacts were outside the parent-school personnel relationship. Correll eliminated these from his analyses and dealt only with parent-initiated interactions on school-related topics. Even so, the remaining 362 contacts during the 1,275 "person-days" of reporting would seem to represent a significant amount of interaction between parents and the school. Just how important it is, though, can only be assessed against comparable data from other communities.

2. Teachers and administrators live in quite different environments of parent interaction. While teachers as a group had more contacts directed to them by parents than administrators as a group, there were many more teachers than administrators. The six administrators had four times the daily rate of interaction as the average teacher. Other data showed that the topics of conversation differed and that the administrators' interaction was with a narrower group of parents, insofar as their social class was concerned, than the teachers' interaction.

3. Parents initiated interaction with high school teachers as frequently as they did with elementary teachers, although there was a difference as to which parent was involved. Not unexpectedly, contact with the elementary teachers was almost exclusively in the province of the mother. In fact, one of the more interesting findings which needs further exploration is the divsion of labor which differs systematically by the social class of the family. I cannot go into the details now.

---

[3] For a summary of some of the research, see W. W. Charters, Jr. "Public Relations," in Chester W. Harris, *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*, 3rd ed.; New York: Macmillan, 1960, pp. 1075-1079. Also see Florence Greenhoe, *Community Contacts and Participation of Teachers*, Washington, D.C.: American Council on Public Affairs, 1941.

[4] Nolan E. Correll, "The Effect of Social Class on Communications with the Public Schools." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Washington University, 1963.

4. As Correll had hypothesized, social class profoundly affected the amount of parent contacts with the school. Although the quasi-agricultural community had neither extreme of the social class scale in its population, there was a regular, direct relationship between social class and incidence of interaction. Lower class parents were almost out of contact with the school, insofar as their self-initiated contacts were concerned. When they did contact the school, it was either teachers, or interestingly enough, custodians, cooks, and other service personnel whom they sought out. Upper class parents had a higher incidence of contact by a factor of six, and when they sought out school personnel, it was either the teacher or board members and administration.

There are some other interesting findings in the study, and, of course, these rather simple data raise more questions than they answer. Especially, we would want to know a great deal more about what happens during the interaction episodes—what kinds of influence flow through the interpersonal contacts. The study suffices to show, however, one aspect of the social psychological perspective: concern for the process of person-to-person interaction at a fairly microscopic level of specificity. To map changes which occur in the interactions of people in on-going social situations has proved to be an extremely enlightening undertaking outside of school administration, and Atwood and Lutz, to name two, have shown it to be enlightening in the realm of the educational institution, Atwood with regard to the high school counseling operation, Lutz with regard to school board policy formulation.[5]

Personalistic Variables in Human Behavior.

A second distinguishing perspective of social psychology is a concern for personalistic variables as well as environmental variables in accounting for regularities in human behavior. Indeed, social psychology has always had a strong phenomenological bent to it, a belief that behavior can only be understood if you know how the individual defines the situation. Let me explain this further. A fundamental maxim of social psychology is that environmental stimuli do not produce identical results in the persons exposed to them. The stimuli are processed by organisms with quite different histories, different motives and interests, and different modes of understanding the world, and the ensuing behavioral consequences are as heterogeneous as the individuals in question. Kurt Lewin expressed this proposition succinctly in his formula, $B=f(P,E)$, behavior is a joint function of person and environment.

---

[5] Mark S. Atwood, "An Anthropological Approach to Administrative Change." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1960. Frank W. Lutz, "Social Systems and School Districts: A Study of the Interactions and Sentiments of a School District." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Washington University, 1962.

School Public Relations.

Another investigation in the field of school public relations illustrates the working of this perspective. In a rather elaborate field experiment, Dr. Robert Zeller compared the success of an item of administrative information in reaching parents of elementary school pupils under two conditions—when the message was disseminated to parents by notes sent home with children and when disseminated by an oral announcement at Parent-Teacher's Association meetings.[6] Zeller interviewed samples of mothers within a day or two of when the messages were dispatched and measured the success of dissemination, among other ways, by the percentage of mothers who had accurate recall of the message. Generally speaking, he found no differences in success under these two conditions of environmental stimuli which could not be explained in obvious ways, such as in the failure of one announcer to make himself heard at the P.T.A. meeting. But Zeller was able to classify the mothers on a personalistic variable—on a measure of opinion leadership—and observed dramatic differences in success. Regardless of mode of message dissemination, 62 per cent of the opinion leaders among the mothers had accurate command of the message contents a day following its transmission whereas only 16 per cent of the remainder had equal knowledge of the contents—a difference of nearly 50 per cent.

A difference this large is truly startling in social science research. It tells those who would investigate problems of school public relations that he should learn more about the myriad small, primary groups in the community and about the persons who stand out in his circle of friends as opinion leaders. No longer can we be satisfied with studies of the effects of the school's mass communications which treat the individual as though he were an unattached atom in the community. His position in the structure of social relations must be introduced as a significant variable in order to understand his reception of the mass communications messages.[7]

PERSONAL ORIENTATION VARIABLES

Insistence upon the importance of personalistic variables gives rise to a third aspect of the social psychological perspective. This is the emphasis which social psychology places upon measuring, describing, and accounting for an individual's attitudes, motives, values, self-conceptions, or other forms of personal orientation. It is not entirely misleading to define social psychology, as some writers used to do, as the science of attitudes. While there are major contributions to social psychology which do not deal with attitude-like variables, any book which does concern itself with the attitudes and beliefs among the citizenry will surely be regarded as a social psychological study.

---

[6] Robert H. Zeller, "Diffusion and Recall Differences between Two Ways of School-to-Home Communications." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Washington University, 1959.

[7] This view has been argued strongly by Elihu Katz and Paul F. Lazarsfeld in *Personal Influence*, Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1935.

School Organization and Teaching Personnel.

Two Washington University investigations into the consequences of school organization for a sense of powerlessness among teaching personnel help to illustrate the interest of social psychologists in variables of personal orientation. As private as a person's attitudes, opinions, and convictions may seem, especially to the person who holds them, it is a fundamental tenet of social psychology that they are social products. So it is with the form of societal alienation known as sense of powerlessness.

In a dissertation completed in 1962, Roland Keene made the following analysis of what happens in school systems as they increase in size.[8] Strongly associated with organization size but not perfectly correlated is organizational complexity. Thus, larger school systems are inclined to have a more intricate division of labor in the realm of instruction and, generally, to have a more highly inter-connected work structure. (Keene demonstrated correlations in the neighborhood of .8 between measures of size and of complexity in 12 Illinois high schools.) Greater complexity in the school's work structure complicates the problem of maintaining coordination among the diverse activities; more administrative effort must be devoted to coordination. Now there are two principal mechanisms by which coordination is accomplished under such circumstances—by vesting responsibility for coordination in a subordinate officer or by laying out highly detailed specifications of performance for the workers. In the one instance, coordination among specialists is achieved through the person of a non-specialist, in the other by an impersonal plan which imposes standardization. Keene produced detailed evidence from the 12 high schools to indicate how both means of coordination become more and more stringent in the larger schools, especially coordination by standardization.

At this point in the analysis, Keene raised a crucial question: What happens to the teaching under such restrictive conditions of work? In particular, what happens to the teacher's sense that he can exercise the independent judgment for which his specialized training presumably prepared him. It is in the larger schools, of course, where one finds the most experienced and highly trained teachers. Professional competence to make decisions is greatest in precisely the high schools where the realm of discretion is most highly circumscribed. Keene collected enough data on teacher responses to standardization only to suggest, first, that the informal colleague groups among teachers interposed themselves between the individual and the organization to protect him from loss of autonomy and, second, in one large high school where interposition did not occur, teachers suffered seriously from a sense of powerlessness and resignation.

---

[8] Roland Keene, "Operational Freedom in Complex Organizations." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Washington University, 1962

While Keene was unable to pursue the latter part of his study with the care it deserved, nevertheless his social psychological vision was clear. The nature of the social structure which the individual inhabits holds important consequences for his psychological attributes, including his sense of well-being.

Gerald Moeller had the same vision as he sought the roots of feelings of powerlessness in the bureaucratic settings in which teachers work.[9] He developed an extremely good six-item scale to measure powerlessness (or, conversely, sense of power) with respect to school system policies and took data on 600-odd teachers in 20 St. Louis area school systems. I do not intend to report on his numerous findings but only to concentrate on one graph which he presented. He separated his teachers, first, into those who taught in school systems judged to be highly bureaucratized and those who taught in relatively unbureaucratized systems. There were ten systems of each kind. In both types, then, he separated teachers according to the number of years they had taught in the system, and he calculated the mean sense of power scores for each service group, from first-year teachers to 20 year-plus teachers. He plotted the means and connected them in lines to show the trend in sense of power with increasing years of service, in high and low bureaucracies separately. The resulting graph displayed three provocative facts.

1. At virtually every category of years of service, teachers in the high bureaucracy systems had markedly greater sense of power scores than their counterparts in the relatively unbureaucratized systems.

2. This difference existed even among teachers who were in their first year of teaching in the school system, and there was no indication that the curves drew further apart with increasing length of service.

3. In both kinds of school systems, first-year teachers had extremely

---

[9] Gerald H. Moeller, "The Relationship between Bureaucracy in School System Organization and Teachers' Sense of Power." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Washington University, 1962.

high sense of power scores—about as high as teachers who had been in the school for twenty years or more—and the scores then plummeted to an extremely low point for teachers in their second and third years of service. After this sharp dip, sense of power scores gradually increased with service.

These three facts pose a typical problem in social psychological analysis. To what extent are teachers' feelings of power over their work attributable to situational or to dispositional factors? Teachers in different work situations differ in sense of power, Fact 1. But Fact 2 suggests that the difference may lie in the kinds of teachers selected by high and low bureaucratic systems—that the difference existed at the outset. Certainly, much research supports the view that sense of power is a highly pervasive attitude which becomes established in persons early in their lives. But one interpretation of Fact 3, regarding the dip in sense of power after the first year of experience, points again to the operation of situational rather than dispositional factors. Furthermore, certain other analyses which Moeller performed on his data showed that organizational structure did have an effect, albeit an intricate one, on sense of power. Obviously, there are a number of points in Moeller's investigation which demand further exploration. One of the most pressing questions is whether the trends in sense of power associated with increasing service in the schools represent changes in individual teachers or whether they represent changes in composition of the teaching staff. Only longitudinal data will tell, but in either event there are fascinating questions to answer.

THE VALUE OF CUMULATIVE RESEARCH FINDINGS IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

This leads me to one final point bearing not on uniquely social psychological matters but on a matter of general research strategy. Throughout this paper, I have argued implicitly that we must take seriously the research findings of other students and the questions they leave unanswered. Only in this way can we have a truly cumulative body of knowledge in school administration. Serious attention to the findings of other studies includes a willingness to replicate the research. Large differences, significant at the .001 level, may well disappear when the research is repeated, and it is well to check out this possibility before spinning elaborate explanations for the findings. Testimony to the wisdom of this advice will be found in my recent Cooperative Research Program report, where some highly intriguing findings from a previous doctoral investigation vanished into thin air.[10]

---

[10] W. W. Charters, Jr., *Teacher Perceptions of Administrator Behavior*, U.S. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Program, Final Report, Project 929, 1964.

There are other perspectives which more or less distinguish the social psychological approach from other modes of social science investigation, but I have covered what I regard as the more salient. There is, first, the concern for studying episodes of interaction at a reasonably specific level. There is, second, the insistence on introducing personalistic variables into any account of the effects of the environment upon behavior. Social psychologists, thirdly, often take some personal orientation, like attitude or sense of powerlessness, as a subject to investigate in its own right, regarding it as a product of the social condition. With perspectives such as these, social psychological analysis can supplement and extend the contributions of its neighboring disciplines.

5

Decision Tools for Education

By
WERNER Z. HIRSCH

Decision Tools for Education

WERNER Z. HIRSCH
Institute of Government and Public Affairs
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, Los Angeles

WHAT KIND of education should we offer, and how much? When, where, how, by whom, and for whom? Who should pay for it, and by what method? These decisions are made in the United States in a decentralized manner within a system of political and fiscal federalism. For example, many key primary and secondary education decisions are made by tens of thousands of school districts which on the one hand interact with the electorate, and on the other hand with state (and to a lesser extent federal) decision makers.

In this paper we will be concerned with macro and not micro decisions. We will not discuss, for instance, where a school should be built and how much it should run for the sake of maximum efficiency. Specifically, in this paper we will consider two relatively novel, closely related, administrative and fiscal decision tools—program budgeting and benefit-cost analysis. The usefulness and applicability of some of the notions that will be developed in this paper can perhaps best be illustrated by referring to some recent testimony given by Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, who stated:

> . . . we soon encounter . . . diminishing returns, where each additional increment of resources used produces a proportionately smaller increment of overall defense capability. While the benefits to be gained from each additional increment cannot be measured with precision, careful cost effectiveness analyses can greatly assist in eliminating those program proposals which clearly contribute little to our military strength in terms of the cost involved. . . .
>
> Suppose we have two tactical fighter aircraft which are identical in every important measure of performance, except one, Aircraft A, can fly ten miles per hour faster than Aircraft B. However, Aircraft A costs $10,000 more per unit than Aircraft B. Thus, if we need about 1,000 aircraft, the total additional cost would be $10 million.
>
> If we approach this problem from the viewpoint of a given amount of resources, the additional combat effectiveness represented by the greater

> speed of Aircraft A would have to be weighed against the additional combat effectiveness which the same $10 million could produce if applied to other defense purposes—more Aircraft B, more or better aircraft munitions, or more ships, or even more military family housing. And if we approach the problem from the point of view of a given amount of combat capability, we would have to determine whether that given amount could be achieved at less cost by buying, for example, more of Aircraft B or more aircraft munitions or better munitions, or perhaps surface-to-surface missiles. Thus, the fact that Aircraft A flies ten miles per hour faster than Aircraft B is not conclusive. We still have to determine whether the greater speed is worth the greater cost. This kind of determination is the heart of the planning-programming-budgeting, or resources allocation problem within the Defense Department.[1]

Secretary McNamara's discussion relates to the application of program budgeting and benefit-cost analysis to national defense. But unlike the Department of Defense which has sole responsibility to administer and finance the United States defense effort (and is using both tools effectively), the responsibility for the administering and financing of education is greatly dispersed. Thus, in many cases, special program budgets for different governments need to be prepared—and the same holds for benefit-cost analyses.

PROGRAM BUDGETING

In order for decision-makers to acquire insight into the future while making decisions in the present, they should have an opportunity to compare the implications of carrying out alternative programs. This would be of great assistance in the intelligent allocation of financial resources. For example, the federal government must decide whether to invest more in primary or higher education or to retain the status quo. Primary education and higher education are programs in the sense of the program budgeting technique; they are more concerned with end-products than with the inputs needed, such as personnel, construction and equipment.

We will next identify some key characteristics of useful education program categories. Ideally, each program should have the following features:

1. It should directly and effectively relate to the nation's major education objectives, and in this sense it should be end-product oriented.

2. It should lend itself to a meaningful breakdown into sub-programs or program elements, which can readily be related to each other.

---

[1] Statement of Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara before the House Armed Services Committee on the Fiscal Year 1965-66 Defense Program and 1965 Defense Budget, January 27, 1964.

3. It should have administrative relevance and provide for administrative effectiveness.

4. It should directly relate to sources of funds and facilitate viable intergovernmental fiscal relations.

While it is difficult to identify education programs that meet all four criteria, we will make some suggestions in Table I. The first four programs–primary, secondary, higher and adult education–are related to the lifetime flow of students through the formal education system, while library services and research (and development) in educational institutions and research centers are important support programs. International education falls into a slightly different category in that it can involve itself in education on all levels, the direct beneficiaries, however, being foreigners.

Table I

EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN AN IDEALIZED
FEDERAL BUDGET

- Primary Education
- Secondary Education
  - College Preparatory
  - Vocational
- Higher Education
  - Junior College
  - College
  - Graduate
  - Post-Graduate
- Adult Education
  - Continuous General (Liberal) Education
  - Continuous Vocational (Professional) Education
    - Government Employees
    - Non-Government Employees
  - Retraining
- Library Services
- Research (and Development)
- International Education

Brief reference will be made to one important aspect of program budgeting. Specifically, the program budget attempts to give expression to the "full-cost" implications of a decision, i.e., it includes costs from the first year to the last, rather than merely its "down payment." Since all three levels of government, as well as the private sector, participate in the education process, each of the four will have to construct its own program budget and properly relate it to those of the other units.

Unresolved Problems.

Many difficult problems remain unresolved. They include arguments as to which are the most useful program element categories, which truly involve mainly educational activities, how to provide accurate and relevant budget estimates, what organizational and control structure promises to use program budgeting effectively, etc. It is by no means clear whether under the 1964 Economic Opportunities Act (the War on Poverty) the $72.5 million work study program, which provides pay for up to 15 hours a week for college youths and is administered by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, should be placed in an "education" or a "welfare" program. There are many such examples and the ultimate choice depends upon which breakdown and arrangement appears most appropriate for the purposes at hand.

BENEFIT-COST ANALYSIS

With the aid of benefit-cost analysis (often also referred to as cost-effectiveness or cost-utility analysis) we will attempt to spell out, quantitatively if possible, direct and indirect costs and benefits of public education and to specify the persons or groups upon whom costs and benefits fall. Such an analysis is designed to assist the decision-maker in selecting available alternatives regarding the level, composition, management and financing of programs, and it closely supplements program budgeting.

It is important to realize that except for the consumption part, education benefits differ from costs in their time horizon. While costs are incurred during the year in which education is provided, few of the benefits are realized at that time. Rather, education benefits exhibit a similarity to capital assets in their long-run nature. The benefits of education capital become difficult to isolate and measure when they blend into the social fabric forming an integral part of the culture of society. To the extent that education benefits are measurable, a lifetime investment approach must be taken, discounting the stream of future benefits back to the year for which the cost analysis is made. This technique provides comparability in that costs associated with the education of a single year—the budgetary period for most education expenditure decisions—can be examined and compared with benefits related to the same period.

Benefit and Cost Components—
Primary and Secondary Public Education.

Let us look at some of the benefit and cost components of one major education program—primary and secondary public education.

In Table II the annual benefit cost statement is composed of two columns—benefits and costs for a given year.

Costs.

Cost entries represent the values in alternative employment of resources allocated to education. Some are direct, i.e., they appear with specific reference to education in the accounting statements of public or private units; others are imputed. Some of the imputed costs such as services rendered by municipalities, are financed out of taxes, and others are not. Either operating or capital resources may be employed. Among the more interesting imputed operating costs which are not tax financed are the earnings foregone by students while they attend school and various expenses incurred by the students and parents while the former receive their education. All these, together with the largest single cost item, i.e., the direct operating costs associated with teaching and non-teaching manpower and materials, constitute the overall cost of operating resources.

Table II

Annual Benefit-Cost Statement of Public Education

Costs	Benefits
A. *School district*	A. *Direct long-run benefits*
Direct operating cost Direct capital cost	Incremental productivity and disposable income of students
B. *Municipality*	B. *Direct short-run benefits*
Municipal service cost	Incremental disposable income of mothers for whom schools provide custodial childcare and with it an opportunity to seek outside employment
C. *Private Sector*	C. *Indirect long-run benefits*
Miscellaneous student and parental cost Foregone earnings	Tax reduction and/or service improvement for non-student families from students' incremental income Incremental productivity and earnings of co-workers Informal education in students' future homes Declining service needs for protection and social welfare
	D. *Indirect short-run benefits*
	Tax reduction and/or service improvement for non-student families, resulting from the income of students' working mothers

There are four major capital costs: annual principal repayment and annual interest on outstanding debt are direct costs; the excess of annual capital consumption over annual principal repayment and interest on school district equity constitute the imputed portion of the costs.

Benefits.

Turning next to the benefit side, we consider total or social benefits of education as the outward extension of the utility possibility function of society, just as costs are defined as the contraction of that function. The difference between total benefits and costs is the net benefit (or cost) to society associated with reference to a particular education decision.

What are the major forces that can push outward the utility possibility function? First, there are those aspects of education which increase production possibilities (e.g., improved skills and capabilities of students) and those which make possible the reallocation, total or partial, of resources. For example, it appears that the presence of educated individuals in a community can reduce such activities as law enforcement, fire protection and certain public health services, and as a result resources are freed for other uses. However, to the extent that education merely alters relative prices without affecting total utility opportunities for a particular group, it is omitted from the list of social benefits (or costs).

While we are concerned with benefits which occur within the market, some do lie outside it. These are most difficult to measure. The short-run satisfaction gained by parents and students from youngsters' exposure to new ideas and culture (consumption benefits), and the long-run special contributions that educated persons make to civic and charitable causes, are not under consideration. They are excluded in order that the benefit concept be consistent with the oportunity cost concept, which covers only resources used for education that have an alternative market value.

As mentioned earlier, most education benfits add to long-run satisfaction. These capital resource benefits include the incremental productivity and earnings of students (and their families) attributable to education. Furthermore, there are some short-run or current benefits which are direct in nature and which accrue to the student's family while he attends school. After children enter school they no longer require the attention of their mothers during the daytime. As a consequence, mothers of students are enabled to seek employment outside the home and a partial increment in the output of society results as resources are reallocated.

Many people other than the student and his family derive benefits from education. Indirect long-run benefits include those to non-student families which possibly lower their taxes or increase their services or both. If the level of one's consumption of public services is independent of one's education and income, then the additional taxes generally paid by persons with more education and income tend to decrease tax burdens upon other taxpayers and/or offer them more services.

Schooling can increase the productivity and income of the former student's co-workers. Schooling may also benefit the student's future children, who will receive informal education in the home. Other possible benefits, partly financial and partly non-financial, will be mentioned briefly. Increased education may result in a decline in service needs through a reduction of police, judicial and other costs of crime, delinquency and law enforcement costs, as well as welfare payments; neighborhood living conditions may improve by the application of positive social values developed in children by the schools; employers may be helped by having available a well-trained, skilled labor force; and society at large may be favorably affected by education which furnishes the basis of an informed and literate electorate.

The benefit-cost analysis proposed above continues to offer a number of major challenges to the imaginative scholar and enlightened school official. Some are conceptual while others involve the solution of difficult measurement problems, particularly those problems involving the more tangible aspects of education.

PROGRAM BUDGETING
BENEFIT-COST ANALYSIS

Some Tentative Applications.

Before we consider some applications, further methodological considerations are in order. As soon as we include the question of who pays for, and how much is paid for public education under the federated fiscal system we can no longer be satisfied with a simple cost analsis. Instead, costs must be translated into burden statements. This translation requires a tax shifting or incidence analysis. Since within the context of today's highly industrialized and mobile economy people as well as commercial activities and products continually cross political boundaries, a spatial incidence or cost spillover analysis is needed to help estimate the wide diffusion of effects that can be expected from government education decisions.[2]

---

[2] This issue is more fully treated in a recent study by Werner Z. Hirsch, Elbert Segelhorst and Morton Marcus, *Spillover of Public Education Costs and Benefits.* Los Angeles: Institute of Government and Public Affairs, University of California, 1964, 465 p.

Furthermore, careful and explicit consideration must be given to existing intergovernmental relations and their effects on the benefit-burden picture. Let us illustrate this point. A local school district's program budget, before it can be used to decide on the pros and cons of a 10 per cent budget increase, needs to be supplemented by some incisive information on possible ensuing changes in state and federal support that could have a multiplier effect. At the same time the burden changes resulting from increased state and federal expenditures would have to be reflected.

We would like to present now three partial applications of program budgeting and benefit-cost analysis. They should be looked upon as examples designed to stimulate others to move further in this direction.

Example I:

The first example is a hypothetical one designed to elucidate a decision facing federal officials. The specific issue is whether the federal government should give more financial support to primary and secondary education or to higher education. On the assumption that the two are separate programs, how can program budgeting elucidate this decision? Let me hasten to add that in my opinion our present ability to apply program budgeting is very limited and its main use is to sharpen our judgment. An analysis of the federal budget for fiscal 1963 in line with programs outlined in Table I, reveals a Federal contribution of about one billion dollars to finance primary and secondary education and of one and a quarter billion dollars for higher education.[3] However, the first figure includes almost $400 million each for such indirect supports as the school lunch program and aid to federally impacted areas in lieu of taxes. Across the board direct support amounts to slightly more than $100 million. On the other hand, most of the federal support to higher education directly benefits this activity.

What are some of the major considerations to be applied to this program budget for information? As was mentioned earlier we would like to have some estimate of the multiplier effect of spending, for example, a further billion on either primary and secondary or higher education. In part, this will depend on the matching conditions attached to the federal aid. At present, federal aid per student given directly to primary and secondary education is substantially lower than that given to higher education, even after adjustments for differential costs have been made. Since education has a vertical structure, good college education is likely to be so much more effective when it is accorded to youngsters with a solid primary and secondary education. Finally, in the absence of a major crisis requiring, for example, a mammoth increase in the supply of scientists and engineers, an orderly long-run program, well-balanced in all levels of education, appears to be in order.

---

[3] *The Budget for Fiscal Year 1965.* Washington, D.C., 1964 and Appendix to the Budget of the United States for Fiscal Year 1965. Washington, D.C., 1964.

Example 2:

At this point let us explore the application of benefit-cost analysis to elucidate a higher education decision. Early in 1964 the Education Policies Commission proposed universal junior college education. The relative merits of this proposal can be analyzed with the aid of a benefit-cost analysis.[4]

There are 908,000 "potential" college students who, according to the proposal at hand, would enter colleges to be educated for a two-year period. For simplicity's sake, it will be assumed that:

1. These 908,000 youngsters will be in college on a full-time basis.

2. Costs will be the same as those of college students presently enrolled in various institutions. (Since junior colleges are less expensive to operate than regular liberal arts colleges or universities during the freshman and sophomore years, this assumption produces an upward cost bias.)

3. Benefits will be the same as those of college students presently enrolled in various institutions. (Since junior colleges are likely to offer education inferior to that of other institutions of higher learning and, more importantly, the caliber of those presently not in college is on the average inferior to that of those attending college, this assumption produces an upward benefit bias.)

4. Marginal cost equals average cost.

Under these assumptions additional operating costs of $2.8 billion, capital costs of $.7 billion, foregone earnings of $.4 billion and miscellaneous private costs of $.2 billion, or a total of $4.1 billion a year can be expected. Incremental annual student income benefits (in present value terms) of $2.5 billion can be anticipated. The resulting benefit-cost ratio would be about .63.

While this ratio does not reflect all the items that are germane to the proposal at hand (a good example is the employment impact of the proposal) it appears to indicate that investment in universal junior college education is likely to produce negative returns. At the same time, under similar assumptions, adding eight-week sessions for five summers following the 7th through 11th grades would produce a benefit-cost ratio of 2.2. Furthermore, its social cost would tend to be much smaller than that associated with the junior college proposal—perhaps only one-third in amount. On the other hand, if we are concerned about the fact that today about 3.5 million teenagers are in the work force and 2 million of them are out of work, placing teenagers into junior colleges is a very attractive way of reducing unemployment in the immediate future.

---

[4] The Education Policies Commission, *Universal Opportunity for Education Beyond the High School.* Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1964.

Example 3:

Finally, let us take a look at the school district trying to decide who benefits and who pays for its primary and secondary education. The case study pertains to the school district of Clayton, Missouri, a wealthy suburb of St. Louis.[5]

The total costs of education provided by this city in 1959-1960 approached $2.9 million. Of this amount Clayton spilled out over $1.2 million or nearly 43 per cent. Almost half of locally financed direct operating costs, which constitute about 55 per cent of the total cost, were shifted to other areas. The inability, by definition, to shift foregone earnings, costs and miscellaneous costs to students and their families led to imputed operating costs emerging as 41 per cent of Claytonians' burden of their education.

The $1.2 million cost spillout from Clayton was more than counterbalanced by cost spillins from other areas totaling $4.4 million. Net cost spillovers were over $3.1 million and, with respect to costs, Clayton would have been better off in a world without spillovers. Clayton's total cost burden of public education offered throughout the United States was $6 million, or twice the amount of the social costs of education provided by Clayton What was responsible for Clayton's "unfavorable" cost spillin-spillout position? The basic factor was the local tax offset provisions of the progressive federal and state income taxes paid by the well-to-do Claytonians. Since they face a higher-than-average marginal tax rate, Claytonians tend to bear a heavy burden of the local property taxes that are offset, i.e., deducted from taxable income.

On the benefit side, Clayton generated $3.8 million in social benefits. Of these, Clayton retained 78 per cent, spilling out only $834,000. Benefit spillins to Clayton (over $1.5 million) exceeded spillouts by $690,000. Clayton would be worse off in a world without spillovers, since net benefit spillins raised Clayton's benefits from education in all areas 18 per cent over the level of benefits Clayton generated itself.

Specifically, a combination of cost burden and benefit findings reveals that Clayton generated net social benefits of $933,000. However, because cost spillouts greatly exceeded benefit spillouts, Clayton itself realized from its own education net benefits of $1.3 million. The cost spillins to Clayton from education provided elsewhere overwhelmed the favorable benefit spillin to leave Clayton with a net cost burden of education provided by all areas of $1.5 million. In short, while society realized a 32 per cent net return on the social cost of Clayton's education, Clayton received only 75 cents on each dollar of cost burden it realized from education in all areas.

---

[5] Hirsch, Segelhorst, Marcus, *op. cit.*

What, for example, are the implications of these findings for distributional equity? If before tax per capita income is selected as the index of wealth, and the criterion of equity in relation to intercommunity spillovers is that spillovers should benefit the poorer areas relative to the wealthier ones, then Clayton's spillover relations with four of the five other study areas are working in the direction of equity. The poorer another area is in relation to Clayton, the more spillovers operate to diminish the wealth differential.

In summary, the case study indicates that spillovers are of major magnitude for the individual school district but existing patterns of economic interaction and fiscal interdependence, aided by the progressive features of the federal income tax, are precluding major inequitable consequences.

CONCLUSION

This short exposition of two new administrative fiscal tools for the education decision-maker should convince us that they can become powerful aids if inquisitive scholars and administrators join forces to further perfect them.

6

Cultural Factors in the Educational Process

By
DOROTHY LEE

Cultural Factors in the Educational Process

DOROTHY LEE
Department of Anthropology
IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

FOR THIS STUDY, I have chosen societies where education is pursued on the initiative of the individual, and where this process requires that the individual, child and adult, endure hardship which in our eyes is so forbidding, and obstacles so blocking as to discourage all readiness to learn. I have made this selection, because in this way I can emphasize my point and support my thesis: that when education is necessary to the deep and pervasive values of the community, and the significance, or the carrying out of the significant role of the individual, it does not need to be motivated externally. It is, in general, undertaken readily, through an inner urge.

My presentation is based almost exclusively on the analysis of personal accounts, where a number of people are reporting on the same general situations. This is material on which I have drawn before in other studies with a different focus. I have drawn on it again for this study, simply because I can find no other source that will give me just what I want.

COMPARISONS OF THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS IN TWO SOCIETIES

The first society I shall take up is that of the Jews of Eastern Europe, the Jews of the shtetl, which finally ceased to exist during the Second World War. Their education was a highly literate one, with schools and scholarly texts. The second society I shall speak about is that of the Plains Indians of this country, and particularly of the Dakota Indians among whom a number, born when the culture had its integrity, wrote or dictated their autobiographies. In both cases, I imagine that the recounting of the autobiography itself is a selective factor within the population; and the selection of items for presentation as well as the items themselves, must be affected by years of life and experience. I therefore base what I say on situations about which two or more accounts show agreement. I should add that I use the term "society" for the sake of brevity, whereas I refer to a number of societies sharing a basically same culture.

What these two societies, the highly literate and the "primitive" had in common was a cultural framework within which education made complete sense; in fact, within which a person could not be fully human without education. The educational process in both was what we could call immensely demanding; but, since this term has for us the implication of something grim, I should say instead that it was strongly inviting. Everything in the child's experience, from birth on, conveyed to him the significance of education, and the awe for the educated. And in both there was no limit to education; the process ended only with death. In both, the individual, guided and encouraged and applauded by the community, set his own pace, sought the difficult willingly and effortfully at his own initiative, perhaps seeking to find honor in his own eyes and in the eyes of his community; perhaps seeking to be and continue to be, fully human and in this way carry out his responsibility to his community. The education I shall be speaking of refers only to men. Among the Eastern European Jews, book-learning was the prerogative, the duty and often the privilege only of men. As for the Plains Indians, since my accounts come only from men, I limit myself to the education of men.

THE JEWS OF EASTERN EUROPE

The Jewish kheder to which a boy went, often literally pulled away from his mother's arms as early as at the age of three, has everything wrong with it. Ten years ago, I believe we would have said that, first of all the child was biologically incapable of doing what he was expected to do, and in fact did; and secondly, that he would develop a strong resistance to learning, and particularly a hatred of all books.

Beginning the Education Process.

The little boy, at the age of three—five is mentioned as a deplorably late age to start school—was given a prayerbook as his first book; a book printed for adult use, with small print and no illustrations; and following the teacher's pointer, he had to learn to recognize and memorize first individual letters and then words in an unknown language—in Hebrew, which he heard on ceremonial occasions, but with no understanding since his own speech was Yiddish. Only after the boy had proved that he could read, was he taught to translate; and even now, this did not mean understanding. What he translated referred to ideas probably far beyond his grasp.

There was nothing in the physical surroundings to compensate for this. In fact, the conditions were what I would call repelling. The children sat on long hard benches without backs. They sat on these for ten hours with perhaps an hour off for lunch and play. The room was crowded and ill-lit. Even after a lapse of fifty-five years, Morris Cohen remembers how ill-ventilated his school was. In the winter it was cold, and the children lucky enough to own coats kept them on through the day; but some did not even have shoes to protect their feet against the snow, or to warm them through the long hours. There were no toys to beguile, no paper or pencil or crayons, no blackboards, nothing to sweeten learning.

All this might have been made bearable, given an alert and loving teacher; one concerned with the development of the children, enthusiastic over learning and teaching. But there was no such teacher in this first school to engender the love of book-learning and whet the appetite. The kheder teacher was the only man who sold his learning, which should be offered joyously as a gift, a mitzva, a deed of merit. This in itself meant that the teacher was not respected. In the higher schools, the higher kheder and the yeshiva, the rebbe was afforded the opportunity to share his knowledge; and he was a man who devoted his entire life to scholarly learning and the sharing of learning. But in the first kheder, in which the young boys were started on the path of life-long scholarship, the melamed was usually a man who had failed in other occupations, and who had had to admit to failure as a scholar. None of the writers has a good word for him. He is remembered as a bitter, incompetent, frustrated man, selling his meager knowledge. He did nothing to stimulate learning, except for plying his ruler freely on little knuckles when attention wandered, and his long birch-rod or cat-o'nine-tails for more serious offenses.

After some months at this school, when the boy had mastered the mechanics of reading, he was graduated to studies which included translation into Yiddish. Now he was given the Pentateuch to read; but not the mystery of Creation, or the heroic tales of battles and kings. His first reading was the Leviticus, the "dull and difficult theory of sacrifices," in the words of a man who went through such a school.

From such beginnings sprang life-long scholars, men whose dream it was to spend all their waking hours, throughout their lives, in scholarly study and discussion; young boys who voluntarily spent their only weekly holiday, the Sabbath, to further their learning. Morris Cohen recalls how he enjoyed staying in the synagogue to listen to a Reb read a commentary on the Pentateuch; how in the summer, when he could have spent the afternoon roaming in the countryside, he would return to the synagogue to read some pious book, or go to the kheder to read the only available tractite on the Talmud. All this took place when he lived with his grandfather, whom he left when he was nine. Another man remembers how, before he was ten, he chose to study with a rabbi whose day was so full that the boy had to have his lesson at five in the morning. Of course, to make this possible, the great rabbi himself was ready to get up by five, and to simplify matters, invited the boy to stay in his house. He received no pay; he was ready to respond to the intellectual appetite of the young scholar. Young boys, even before their teens, often travelled at their own initiative to a famed yeshiva in a distant town, where they "had no home except the synagogue. They slept on benches, on tables, on the floor, they picked up their meals wherever they could."

The Strong Desire to Learn.

What motivated a boy to do this? My question is culture-bound. In fact, my entire presentation is culture-bound; only at one point I could not resist pointing out that the great rabbi was ready to respond to the little boy's search for scholarly learning. All along, I have presented the situation from my point of vantage, seeing hardship, deprivation, obstacles, the repellent. I therefore referred to the need for sweetening, beguiling, compensation; to the need to stimulate learning and whet the appetite. I wonder whether any of my readers were rendered uncomfortable by this.

The fact is, I think, that the boy did not need to be motivated. The interest was there, the appetite was keen, the desire to learn was there moving the boy to exertion and endurance. From birth on, the boy had imbibed the value of education, listening to his mother's lullabies while she sang of her hopes that he would grow to be a scholar, or that his baby-sister would bring a learned bridegroom to the family. When he sat in his father's lap, he swayed with the rhythm of his father's chanting as he read reverently from the great book, and drew his attention to the "black points" on the page.

If his father was fortunate enough to have a wife who would work to support the family, to release him so that he could dedicate himself to scholarship, or a well-to-do father-in-law honored in the support of a learned son-in-law and his family, then the boy saw his father occupied with his books all day. If the father was not so fortunate, the boy saw him get up an hour or two before he had to go to work, so that he could pursue his studies. Or, if his father was unable to do even this, the son could witness his frustration.

Morris Cohen speaks of his father, who was at that time a household servant and handyman, as not happy because first of all he was "deprived of all opportunity of continuing his studies." The son did continue his studies, even when, aging and in uncertain health and failing energy, with the glory of California raging around him, he wished that he could "relax and enjoy" himself; that is, that he might be able to devote himself to reading, out-door walking and intellectual converse with friends, "and thus pass my days as much in peace and comfort as the opportunities afford." This statement seems natural coming from a great and famous professor of philosophy; yet it is no different from the wishes he had when he was a ten-year-old at Minsk, or those of his father, the poor handyman.

The Value Placed on Education.

All self-respecting people around the growing boy paid to have their boys taught reading, however scanty their income; that is, if they had any income at all. If there were well-to-do people in the community, they might support, gladly, a kheder for the children of the destitute. Even what we would call bare subsistence would be whittled down for the sake of finding the fee for the melamed. Mary Antin recounts the schooling of her father in a Polish ghetto; the son of an itinerant peddler who was such a failure in his enterprises that his Sabbath coat and the Sabbath-eve-candlesticks were usually in pawn through the week, to buy the family food. Yet since the melamed must be paid, the mother would often go without food all day, pawn her shawl, walk barefoot in winter, and triumphantly raise the necessary amount for that which was valued preeminently. This was the boy's value environment; and his pursuit of learning was without bounds. Such was the value of education that his, which we might be tempted to call sacrifice, was merely the giving of that which was wanted less for that which was unquestioningly wanted most of all. And in setting the son upon the path of honor, the family was honoring itself.

The values of the community were consistent with those of the family; and here the boy found that the scholar had the highest standing, however poor in possessions he might be. The learned man was the "beautiful Jew," the "face" of the community, the man who could occupy the place of honor along the East wall of the synagogue. And as he embarked on the pursuit of learning, the boy immediately found this respect directed at him. The father recognized him with respect as he passed the first test of reading, at the age of four or five, and as he went on with his studies of the Pentateuch and the first Commentary. Learned scholars might come to him later, when he was ten or in his early teens, bringing some difficult talmudic question. The story of the boy Jesus among the wise men would have been a commonplace in the Minsk shtetl.

The whole task of learning was enormously and wonderfully demanding, and I doubt that grades and prizes and games and pictures on the wall would have sufficed to "motivate" the child to such exertion. Actually, there was a time when the child was so reluctant that he did have to be motivated externally; this was when the boy, a mere baby, was first taken to school, away from the warmth and comfort of home and mother. "To stimulate the child's interest, at the first lesson, candies or coins are thrown from above him into the open prayerbook from which he is learning his first letters..." The baby cries, the mother cries; but even here, one writer thinks that the mother's tears of separation were also tears of pride. And the boy, in spite of the pain of separation, is ready to enter the life of learning.

Recognition of Individual Qualities.

I do not know whether the cultural emphasis would have been enough in itself if it demanded complete conformity and submergence of individuality. As it is, the individual quality and individual rhythm were recognized even in the deplorable first kheder. Not even here was there a set assignment for all children, though two or three might have to keep the same pace if they had to share a book. Children proceeded each at his own pace; and each child chanted his words loudly at his own pitch and swayed at his own rhythm. The situation was not modified to fit individual peculiarity; instead, the individual was enabled and left free to meet the unyielding situation in his own idiosyncratic way.

As soon as the boy began to translate, to understand not only the face of the word but to look for its referent, he was introduced into inquiry which searched for hidden meaning. This was to be his life work, if he was so fortunate as to be able to devote his life to scholarship. Faced with works upon which countless commentaries had been written and spoken, of which every imaginable interpretation had been made, he was encouraged and expected to search for and find yet another hidden meaning, to come forth with a fresh interpretation and a heretofore unasked question; to address himself to every proposition, to every statement, written or spoken, even to the Word of God, with an original question, born with him. His curriculum was limited to sacred literature, his range was narrow; and perhaps in these very limitations he found challenge, and responded to the call of the limitless. His individual decision was invited in still another sense; throughout the higher kheder and in the yeshiva, and then later through life, he shaped his own curriculum and set his own pace. There was no succession of "classes," no assignments, no grades, no commencement or other mark of graduation.

THE PLAINS INDIANS OF THE UNITED STATES

Similarities and Dissimilarities.

The Plains Indians, of course, present an entirely different picture superficially. There was no literacy here, and no pursuit of scholarship for its own sake. Yet basically, there is much similarity. For the

Jews, education seemed not to serve any utilitarian ends; and strange as it may seem, much of the education of the Dakota was also apparently nonutilitarian. In both cases it had the "utility," however, of enabling a man to find worth in himself, and to be fully man; and this meant, to be in touch with the divine. For the Dakota, it also meant that a boy grew into a responsible member of the community, to whose welfare he was indispensable. The two cases are similar also in that an extremely demanding education was pursued with will and inner urgency.

Here also education started at birth and continued until death, self-sought and systematically pursued. Yet, while punishment was a frequent instrument in the educational experience of the young Jewish boy, it was rare, if not absent, among the Dakota; certainly striking and flogging are reported to be completely absent. The Jewish boy was carried weeping from his mother's arms to begin his formal education; and though according to my sources, most boys were proud to be in school, "learning to be like my father and my brother," as one of them, often beaten, told me, it was taken for granted that they needed the reminder of the stick. Not only in those first months when the learner was practically an infant confronted by material which was incomprehensible and difficult to attend to, but in the later kheder also, the need for prodding was assumed. In fact, punishment seems to have been perceived as an expression of involvement and concern; and the children of such people, born and raised in this country, told research workers that a good mother was "one who punished."

For the Dakota boy, the situation was different. Learning did not involve an enforced act of separation from loved ones and familiar surroundings. In the true sense of the phrase, the Dakota boy never left home, since the camp circle and the prairie or woods beyond it was home, his greater home. Even before he could understand speech, he knew by the behavior of his mother and others, that the earth and all that sprang from it or rested on it was his greater family; and as he later listened to the lullabies and tales, he learned that the earth was the mother who nourished him, on whose lap he could sit with joy and confidence, and that the trees and winds and rocks and animals were his relatives. This was the school in which he pursued a systematic and disciplined education; whether he was receiving a "lesson in obedience" at three, requested to find the rubbing stone wherever it might be in some tipi in the circle, or, at a slightly later age, to catch and bring his father's pony; or whether he was off alone on an all-day ramble, to get acquainted with nature, choosing his own route, with his senses sharp and alert and his attention pointed.

I must make two comments here. One, that this, of course, does not sound like education. The boy is given an errand which he can carry out with pride and honor and certainly with eagerness; or that he goes out on a delightful trip of boyish exploration. And perhaps such a remark points to one of the main troubles in our education. This does not look like education only because it is supremely meaningful, worthy, honorable, exciting. Secondly, I referred to his going out alone; but he was never exactly alone. "There was no such thing as emptiness in the world. . . . Even without human companionship one was never alone. The world teemed with life," wrote Standing Bear.

Education—A Lifetime Process.

Neither was there discontinuity in his education at any time. What was started in early infancy was continued throughout life. The first important lesson a baby was taught was not to cry at night. This was simultaneously a training in self-discipline and in social responsibility; or rather, it was self-discipline for the sake of society, of the camp-circle. To cry at night would be to announce the whereabouts of the camp to the enemy scouts. According to the Indian accounts, this feat of training was actually accomplished.

The responsibility of the individual to educate himself generated and guided all education. The individual set out to strengthen physical and spiritual muscles; to grow in skills and fortitude, in perceptiveness, discrimination, endurance, generosity, knowledge, as a way of carrying out his responsibility to his society. The community collaborated with the individual who sought education.

Learning by Personal Observation and Experience.

The little boy who left the tipi at daybreak on his rambles, came back in the afternoon to find his uncle or his father, the great hunter and warrior, waiting to question him. As he had not been given a list of questions to follow, he had to be sensitive to all around him, addressing himself with pure and original inquiry. If his uncle asked him what birds he had seen he had to be ready to report on the color or shape of the bill, on the song, on the appearance and locality of the nest, and only then the adult would supply the name. His was original research, carried out with disciplined observation and concentration; he was not first handed a bird chart, and asked to fit an actual bird to a label.

He had had training for this. First of all, he had the significance of education impressed upon him from his earliest months. In babyhood, he was addressed as the future provider and defender of the people, and he soon took pride in this prospect. So he sat still when his mother asked him to, and at her bidding, listened until he learned to distinguish the "voice of the aspen" from the "clashing cymbals of the birch;" he learned to look, listen and smell until he could sense the apparently imperceptible. Soon he learned to distinguish the "different birds by the noise of their wings and beasts of prey by the cracking of the twigs upon which they trod," the presence of water by the feel of his skin, and a distant beaver dam by its smell.

The boys were taught to use the data of their own experience as a basis for assigning to categories and arriving at conclusions. Ohiyesa reports a discussion as to which tribe the lizard belonged to, carried on under the guidance of his grandmother. Eventually, a criterion was arrived at, a lizard was found and brought in, and a decision was reached on the basis of observation and experiment, as well as the definition of the different tribes of animals. Another time, the grandmother precipitated a discussion between two brothers on the relative merits of the female oriole and the eagle as mothers. The two boys supported their position, drawing on intimate, precise and multitudinous knowledge, and discussed the relative merits of tenderness versus hardness, as guiding values.

The Recognition of Personal Autonomy.

Like the children of the Jewish shtetl, the Dakota boys were confronted by the unassailable *ought* of culture. The ideal adulthood, presupposing as it did what to my western eyes appears to be an absurdity of fortitude, discipline, generosity, sense-perceptiveness, was an unquestioned given. It did not bend to catch the personal interest nor to meet individual needs. And here, as in the Jewish shtetl, idiosyncracy was recognized and encouraged. In fact autonomy was engendered and supported in a great variety of ways within the family, the community, the religious ceremonial, the political situations.

It required great exertion to become engaged in the pursuit of this education. The boy was enabled to do so through the love and concern of his adult guides. These did not punish. They showed their concern by holding the individual to the difficult experience he must live through without allowing for any kind of anaesthesia or escape. There were the boys sent out on tasks, with the understanding that they would neither eat nor drink until the task was carried out, perhaps after three days. Or a small boy might be asked to fast for a day, with his face blackened as a signal to all his little companions to tempt him with food. A boy of eight might be asked to sacrifice what he loved most, and not allowed to escape from the realization that this was his dog, his inseparable friend. A little boy might be sent to count coup on a wounded buffalo, enraged and vicious, while a circle of adult men watched with concern, offering neither help nor interference. A boy was never "forced" into these experiences; but of course the only escape was into disgrace.

Observation and Imitation of Adult Models.

In this invitation to autonomous learning, there was a minimum of didactic teaching, as of subject matter, for instance. For the taking on of the culture, for becoming a true Dakota man, the boy was taught to observe and imitate a model; and he had already learned to respect and admire the model. He had listened to the stories of the exploits of great hunters and warriors and feast-givers since babyhood; and he had seen the consistent honoring of these people. He could pick his father as a model, or other male adults. The imitation was not apathetic copying. The boy "read and studied actions, movements, posture, intonation, expression and gesture of both man and animal." "When he (father) began work I was sure to be close by, quietly observing," writes Standing Bear. And again, "I remained on the east side of my father. I was watching every move he made . . ." Out of this minutely observed behavior of the different models, the boy got the raw material for creating his own idiosyncratic pattern.

A boy could observe a man rush into danger, calling "this is a good day to die;" he could see him remain motionless in an awkward posture for hours, or inflict unimaginable pain upon himself while imploring Wakan Tanka to help his people. This did not mean that he could therefore imitate. He had to grow within himself, and to keep on exercising the capacities that enabled him to imitate these personal qualities. So boys practiced dealing with fear and pain, first at the suggestion of others, starting mildly, and later at their own initiative, increasing the demand of the situation in fresh ways. They set off on self-imposed tasks, running for a day and night without rest, or exposing themselves to great bodily pain and danger, and learning to be courageous in the face of fear. Apparently the value of the ideal adulthood, the evident honor in which the model was held, were enough to incite the boy to undertake the difficult training. This is not to say, however, that all Dakota boys achieved ideal adulthood.

I have to mention here, only to satisfy my own scruples, that there is a religious dimension to all this, in that a Dakota boy ideally established, in pain and hardship and humility, an immediate relatedness with the Great Mystery, the one in the many; and that the desire to eventually take this leap into the ultimate was a strong factor in his self-education. I am stating this dogmatically; it is so alien to our own views that I would have to write about it at length if I undertook to document my statement.

The Recognition of Effort and Accomplishment.

As among the literate Eastern European Jews, so also among the non-literate Dakota there was a clear, true, and immediate recognition of individual effort and accomplishment. When a little boy brought home his first kill, perhaps a little bird, his father got a crier to announce this feat, and gave away a horse to a needy person, in honor of the boy.

When Standing Bear announced at the age of eleven, that since the honor of the warpath was closed to him, he would go to enemy territory in the newly opened Indian School in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, his father, who had a store selling white man's goods, gave away his entire inventory in honor of his son's courageous decision. When Standing Bear decided to join in the tribal buffalo hunt, on his own for the first time, his step-mother seriously requested him to save her the kidney and the skin. Standing Bear describes the hunt: "All I could hear was the roll and rattle of hoofs of the buffalo as they thundered along . . . I realized how small I was. I really was afraid of them. Then I thought about what my step-mother had said to me about bringing her a kidney and a skin, and the feeling that I was a man, after all, came back to me." He was eight years old.

IN CONCLUSION

In both the societies which I have discussed, education was presented as the only way to achieve full human worth. Individual, family, community, agreed in this. Individual style and rhythm were recognized, encouraged, and developed. Among the Indians at any rate, the individual was trusted to the extent that the society was vulnerable to his success and failure; it clearly depended on his effective and continued education. For people who value freedom of choice, the fact that no true alternative was offered may seem limiting. To my mind, however, there can be choice among alternatives only in areas of low significance. When strong value is involved, then there is only one significant course open to the individual. And he chooses this strongly, with a will; but not in the sense of selecting among alternate courses. His choice is an existential choice; and this, I believe, was present in both the societies I discussed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

DAKOTA INDIANS

Black Elk Speaks. Being the Life History of a Holy Man of the Oglala Sioux, as told to John G. Neihardt. New York: William Morrow and Company, 1932.

Brown, Joseph Epes. *The Sacred Pipe, Black Elk's Account of the Seven Rites of the Oglala Sioux*. Recorded and edited by J. E. Brown. Norman: University of Oklahoma, 1953.

Eastman, Charles A. (Ohiyesa) *An Indian Boyhood*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1902.

Neihardt, John G. *When the Tree Flowered; an Authentic Tale of the Old Sioux World*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1951.

Standing Bear, Luther. *My People the Sioux*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1928.

________. *Land of the Spotted Eagle*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1932.

OTHER PLAINS INDIANS

A Warrior Who Fought Custer, interpreted by Thomas B. Marquis. Midwest Co., 1931.

Linderman, Frank. *American, The Life Story of a Great Indian, Plenty Coups, Chief of the Crows*. New York: John Day, c. 1930.

EASTERN EUROPEAN JEWS

Aleichem, Sholem. *Great Fair, Scenes from My Childhood*. Noonday Paperback.

Antin, Mary. *The Promised Land*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1912.

Cohen, Morris Raphael. *A Dreamer's Journey*. The Beacon Press, 1949.

Gordon, Albert I. *Jews in Transition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1949.

Zborowski, Mark and Elizabeth Herzog. *Life is with People*. New York: International Universities Press, 1952.

7

The Politics of Public Education

By
NICHOLAS A. MASTERS

The Politics of Public Education

NICHOLAS A. MASTERS
Department of Political Science
THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

ONE OF THE MOST potent political instruments in the American setting is the educational enterprise. Although we have found it symbolically useful to regard schools as apart from politics, there is no escaping the fact that our schools are the agencies that "propagate the historical lore of the people, the myths, the beliefs and the faiths and thereby aid in the process of political indoctrination."[1] In the modern industrial state the schools are the apparatus through which social stratification is either preserved or overcome. It has been an integral part of the American dream to use public education as the means for upward social and economic mobility for those disadvantaged by social background or birth.

THE ROLE OF FREE, PUBLIC EDUCATION IN THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SYSTEM

Stated differently, the United States was the first nation to establish free, public education. The theoretical justification for such a pioneer effort was explicitly political. The Jeffersonian vision of a political and social order that would not bury its talents under the rigidities of a class structure was essential to the egalitarian doctrine which has become so much a part of our political thinking. To be sure, the ideal has never been fully attained. Despite the creation of public supported institutions of higher learning, particularly in the Midwestern, Southern, and Western regions of the nation, the costs of higher education have barred many from going beyond high school. And, of more critical and fundamental importance, our educational system has been allowed to develop and flourish at all levels and in all regions without any cognizance of the special problems of the Negro. It is not news to point out that in some parts of the nation the Negro is still deliberately excluded from the opportunities our educational system provides. (I am at this juncture setting aside entirely the attendant problem of lack of motivation as a bar to higher education for the sons and daughters of parents of low status.)

---

[1] V. O. Key, Jr., *Public Opinion and American Democracy*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961, p. 315.

Education—A Factor in Preserving the Political, Social and Economic Order.

The schools, of course, can only be used as avenues for upward social and economic success if they indoctrinate the children with the basic values of our political society. *To move upward and operate within a social and economic system requires acceptance of that system and loyalty to it.* It was no accident that compulsory universal education coincided with our pattern of industrialization. Educational programs were designed not only to staff the manpower needs of the industrial complex, but also to pump in fresh blood at managerial levels that were committed to the system as it was evolving. The economic leaders of earlier generations were not, I am sure, motivated entirely by the Jeffersonian ideals. They had a *vested interest* in seeing to it that we had a more highly skilled and educated population. Education, much to the chagrin of many liberal arts professors, is still linked with our industrial, technological, and military needs. And to this has been added a new dimension, the threat of a competitive external political system. In brief, education is an instrument for developing and preserving our political, social, and economic order.

It is obvious that any social institution that performs such a significant role is not going to be allowed to roam freely within the political structure. Groups and individuals which possess the resources of power and influence exert, or will exert when they feel the occasion demands, tremendous efforts to shape and mold the system to their way of thinking and to tailor the curriculum to meet their special technological and scientific needs.

The importance of the schools in the power system is glaringly visible in regimes of a revolutionary character. Textbooks are rewritten or burned, teachers are brought into line or dismissed. In such a system the revolutionary leaders are inevitably elevated into paragons. Deposed leaders are either condemned or erased from the pages of history. In our educational system, however, the influence of those dominant in the political system is a bit more subtle, mainly because we adhere to the myth that our educational enterprise is a free and independent one. Business, labor, religious, patriotic and sundry other groups all attempt, in one way or another, to make their influence felt but only certain groups allow their concern to lead them into *direct intervention* in school administration matters. Needless to say, it disturbs a number of people that a few groups, usually "patriotic" in character, demand to review textbooks or demand procedures that will assure a certain type of political orthodoxy or the transmission of the values of the American culture as they see it. Episodic acts of direct intervention are not the usual pattern, however, in which educational practices are affected. Less formal and direct pressures are involved. These pressures, I think, are worthy of some further comment.

School authorities are guided by what I shall call the *biases* in the social and economic system, as indeed are most other public and private officials.[2] Schools, like other social institutions, operate within a framework of values, myths, established procedures, and rules of the game. I call these biases, and they are usually mobilized in a particular direction. America is a society characterized by wide consensus on many fundamental political principles. It takes little systematically planned effort or extensive intervention to see that these values are preserved and reinforced within an educational system. For example, no secondary school principal would allow his social studies teacher to condemn or severely criticize the concept of private property. The biases in favor of private property are much too firmly embedded to permit an extreme expression of a defiant view.

Labor unions, despite their recent rise in respectability and status, still find it more difficult to get their viewpoints objectively presented in our schools than do business groups. School systems throughout the nation sanction and encourage junior achievement groups which indirectly have a pro-business orientation. This is not to suggest that such activities are necessarily anti-labor, but I know of no comparable school endeavor designed to develop labor leadership.

The fact that our educational system is controlled by lay authorities, the majority of whom are property owners or professional people, people who have an interest in perpetuating our present political system, means that they are not going to encourage or allow school authorities to embark on an ideological crusade to bring about a sweeping new society which would be organized along entirely different lines. In brief, patterns of power, despite their occasional fluctuation and variations, are able to restrict the content of the educational program while perpetuating the myth of the non-political nature of education. *This means that the myth itself is politically functional.*

Education in the Political Arena.

It really doesn't take very much imagination or understanding, then, to see that schools are important political instruments, that they play a vital function in social mobility, political socialization, and preservation of the political system. But aside from these broad considerations, schools enter the political struggle in other ways and become intensely involved in the competition for money and other tangible benefits necessary for their operation.

---

[2] Peter Bachrach and Morton S. Baratz, "Two Faces of Power," *American Political Science Review* (December 1962), pp. 949-52.

Before I get into specifics, however, I think I should discuss the concept of politics I am using. It has long been customary to say that politics is a dirty word. There is much truth in this view. Politics is a hard and cruel business. It is cruel because it involves conflict or competition and in any competitive struggle not everyone can emerge victorious. To lose when the stakes are high, whether it be in poker, business, love or war, is never easy. A school principal, for example, who appeals to lay boards for a salary increase for his staff may well be placing his job in jeopardy. The ability of a professional group to represent effectively the interest of its members inevitably determines its or its leaders' longevity. The extent to which a professor concerns himself with research has an indelible impact on his career. Yet research funds and facilities are not unlimited. He must compete to secure them. As long as resources are scarce or not unlimited, politics will enter into all phases of man's life. Education is no exception.

To be sure, the ordinary conception of "politics" is that it involves some forms of favoritism or corruption. When someone says that politics was involved in this or that decision he usually means that a particular group received a favor to which it was not entitled. If the favor is outside the limits of the law, corruption is obviously involved; on the other hand, if all legal requirements are met, then the charge is simply "dirty politics." Certainly within the context that I shall use the term, politics involves the promotions of one's interest and the *use* of whatever resources are at one's disposal to protect that interest. Such activity may or may not involve corruption or favoritism.

Resources of Influence.

Before proceding with the examples, I should comment on what I mean by resources of power or influence. Resources are those objects tangible and intangible which are in demand and in short supply. Examples would be money and credit, votes, jobs, information, and status and prestige. Control of the dispensation of these items or commodities is what constitutes a power base. For example, the United Auto Workers in Detroit has extensive influence on many outstate Democratic organizations, including those in cities where there is no union membership. Query: What resources of influence can the UAW in Detroit bring to bear upon outstate organizations? The answer lies in the UAW's selective allocation of workmen's compensation cases involving union members to prominent outstate attorneys. Obviously such allocations are meant to be functional for the UAW's political purposes.

Educators abhor the idea that favoritism or corruption could ever be involved in any of their policies, deliberations, or activities. Education must always be above the various confines of the interest of a particular group. Education must be in the "public interest" and the public is discussed as if it were an organized entity. But such is merely the language or symbolism used. Everyone who has ever been involved knows that decisions are not made in a public interest vacuum. The symbols serve *mainly to ornament the prose rather than to enlighten one about objective reality*. Yet, as I have said earlier, we continue to discuss educational decision-making in largely symbolic terms.

The purpose of this paper is to present a limited amount of evidence in order that the statements we make about our educational system will more closely fit the observable realities.

In seeking to unravel the puzzle of the place of politics in our educational system, I shall rely largely on the unstructured interviews I have had with hundreds of state educational, legislative, and administrative leaders. I assure you, however, that I do not intend to engage in muckraking or to magnify the importance of any particular political practice. My aim is to identify those who seek to influence the content of educational policy and the type and nature of the resources they utilize.

Educational Interests and Resources of Influence

Despite the rather extensive literature on the functions and activities of both organized and unorganized interests in our society, precise information about their political influence is often lacking. This is particularly true with regard to the activities of various interests in education. There are a number of difficulties that stand in the way of systematic analysis. First, we are unaccustomed to the idea that educational interests are engaged in political activity. Second, all group leaderships, and *educational leaders are no execption*, have a vital interest in concealing information. That is, they do not want all of their activities exposed to the public. And third, generalizations applicable to some groups miss the mark entirely when applied to others. But whatever the group or interest involved, whether it be large or small, well-heeled or desperately poor, each much use whatever resources it has at its disposal to affect the outcome.

The Junior College Movement.

Let us examine, for example, the junior college movement in the United States. Almost every state has embarked on a program to expand the opportunities for higher education through the chartering of so-called junior colleges. These colleges, it is alleged, serve a dual function. First, they provide vocational training for those not qualified to go any further. And second, they serve as a feeder to institutions of higher learning, weeding out those who do not qualify.

These purposes, however, are often ignored by politically ambitious groups, particularly when there is no state-wide planning machinery. Pressure mounts from all types of sources to transform a two-year college into a four-year institution and if this is accomplished, to transform a four-year institution into one offering a graduate program. These pressures take many forms. Heavy contributors to legislative candidates may "put the heat on" a local legislator in order to get him to push for expansion of the junior college. Obviously they perceive such expansion as beneficial to their financial interests. The institution itself becomes an entity capable of wielding pressure. Its spokesmen have status in the community and thus help to mobilize public opinion. Often overlooked is that educational institutions are large consumers and thus have some leverage over those who supply them. It should come as no shock that these levers are often used by a junior college president or dean to force suppliers to pressure the legislature to promote the college's interest.

The junior college movement has provided the field for another type of political battle. Should the teachers in community colleges be certified under existing state requirements in the same way as elementary and secondary teachers, or are the teachers in junior colleges to be treated the same as professors and not required to meet any certification requirements at all? Involved here is the often bitter struggle between liberal arts professors and educationists. Also involved is the opportunity for the state affiliates of the NEA to expand their membership and thus expand their opportunities to influence public policy. This cursory examination of junior college issues should suggest some of the ways in which education and politics merge.

Selection of School Board Members.

Another "issue," if I may call it that, which affects every locale and every state is the selection of school board members. In Michigan, for example, the nominations of both parties for members of the State Board of Education are used to: a) provide an opportunity for a politically ambitious young man or woman to run on a state-wide ticket, and b) satisfy the wishes and desires of the state's main educational interests, particularly the Michigan Education Association and the Michigan Federation of Teachers. If this state, however, were ever to move toward the state-wide adoption of textbooks, then I suspect the politics of these nominations would be more along the lines found in the California system. In that state, certain textbook companies contribute substantial sums of money to the campaign coffers or the party coffers of those whom they feel will best represent their interests. I think I can safely say at this point that the importance of campaign finance and the extent to which money can buy influence within the educational system is badly overlooked and misunderstood.

In Chicago, New York, St. Louis, and Detroit the selection or election of the board members follows a pattern in which the influence of certain clearly identifiable interests are apparent. Negro groups, capable of marshalling tremendous financial resources as well as having deliverable votes, demand and get a representation on the board. It would be unthinkable for Wayne County Democrats to ignore the wishes of Negro groups on such a crucial matter.

The protection of certain interests through the appointment or election of supporters of that interest does not stop at the board level. In New York, it is customary to have a Jew, a Catholic, and a Protestant as assistant superintendents. When Negro groups complained of lack of representation at this level, a Negro Catholic was appointed, but only after a bitter fight within the board during which the Catholic members led the opposition.

The Church-State Issue.

Another significant battle concerns the extent to which, or whether at all, church-related schools ought to be aided with public funds. Here the competition for scarce resources takes on a new dimension, dividing the educational community itself along religious lines. The First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The U.S. Supreme Court has interpreted the so called "establishment clause" as stating a principle applicable to Federal and State government: government may not act to burden the free exercise of religion, and it may not act to benefit religion.[3] Moreover, many states have similar constitutional or statutory provisions. Significantly, however, none of the church-state cases that has reached the Supreme Court has dealt *directly* with the constitutionality of a government's allocating money to a church-related institution for the purpose of aiding education, where the main purpose of the institution is considered to be education and not religion.[4] Thus the battle over a proper interpretation of the First

---

[3] See Wm. W. Van Alstyne, "Constitutional Separation of Church and State: The Quest for a Coherent Position," *American Political Science Review* LVII, 4 (December 1963), p. 867.

[4] For an exposition of this point, see Lawrence K. Pettit, "The Policy Process in Congress: Passing the Higher Education Academic Facilities Act of 1963," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1965, pp. 38-45.

Amendment in this regard still rages at the Federal level, and within those states where the State Supreme Court has not dealt with such a case directly and declared public support of parochial schools to be violative of the state constitution.[5] The National Education Association and various of its state affiliates have been in the forefront of the battle, exerting every effort to block the appropriation of public revenue to private schools.

As the positions of the antagonists have rigidified, the church-state issue has become (for the time being) non-negotiable at the elementary and secondary level, and the exacerbation of Protestant-Catholic animosities within Congress have divided the proponents of Federal-aid-to-education proposals so that Congress is immobile in this area.

The Federal Aid Issue.

The Federal-aid-to-education issue involves yet another set of political conflicts at the state and local level. First is the basic question of *whether* Federal aid is desirable. Although the NEA and its affiliates continually represent the professional educators as being in favor of Federal aid, laymen who exercise formal control as school board members or informal influence as prestigious members of the community often oppose Federal aid. A host of liberal-conservative perspectives is involved here, mostly in terms of the scope of Federal activity and the locus of decision-making. Aside from the ideological question of whether the Federal government ought to widen its scope of activities to include direct aid to education, there is a more important question of *power* involved. Local influentials want the important decisions to be made at the local level where they exert control. Thus the ghost of "Federal Control" becomes real to them, and they oppose any increase in Washington's role *vis-a-vis* that of Centerville.[6] On the other hand, those who stand to benefit economically from increased public expenditures prefer to broaden the scope of effective decision-making to the Federal level where they have more relative influence.

Additionally, the Federal-aid-to-education issue engenders controversy over the intended machinery of administering the proposed program. Groups compete to be named in the bill as potential representatives on any special state authority that might be created to administer a Federal aid program.

---

[5] The possibility of such a case eventually reaching the United States Supreme Court improved on September 10, 1963, when the Horace Mann League initiated action in the Maryland Circuit Court in Annapolis to test four Maryland statutes which the League contends violate both the Maryland and the United States Constitutions. The statutes involved in the litigation authorize public funds for the construction of facilities at various church-related colleges in Maryland. See Pettit, *op. cit.* p. 43.

[6] I refer to Federal control as a "ghost" because the proponents of Federal-aid-to-education, mindful of this argument that is used continually by the opponents of such proposals, carefully formulate their proposals in such a way as to include explicit inhibitions on Federal control.

Competition Between Educational Levels.

A related political battle concerns the competition between higher education and the public schools over the allocation of scarce resources. At the national level one need only point to the role of the NEA in defeating the college aid bill of 1962, and the consequent refusal the next year on the part of college-aid advocates in the House of Representatives even to consider a proposal for aid to elementary and secondary schools.[7] At the state level there not only exists a similar dichotomy, but within some states, such as Wisconsin, the teachers' colleges and the University, under separate and autonomous boards of regents, compete for their respective allocations of the higher education share of public funds.

The Effectiveness of Educational Interest Groups.

No sophisticated analyst supposes that the participants involved in the conflicts outlined above merely sit back and wait for public largesse because of the symbolic position they occupy in American society. Rather, these groups and individuals are involved directly in making claims on government. They are engaged in politics. They serve a function for the political system through their articulation of policy demands and their provision of political support for the demands.

Whether the educational interests are particularly effective in the political arena is altogether another question, but it is interesting to examine the NEA in this regard. In terms of the general status of its members (professionals), the legitimacy of the organization and the societal function it promotes (education), and the access its legislative division enjoys to govermental decision-makers, the NEA possesses the prerequisites of effectiveness as enunciated by most students of group theory. Yet, after 30 years' effort, the organization has been unable to secure passage of a direct Federal-aid-to-education bill!

What are the factors that tend to weaken the NEA as a political force? *First* is its regional character. The NEA is essentially a Western, Midwestern and Southern organization—that is, a rural, middle class organization in a rapidly industrializing, urbanizing society. In the larger cities the NEA must compete with teachers' unions, and often the union is the stronger of the two. *Second* is the membership character of the association. Classroom teachers are primarily young women, most of whom eventually leave the profession altogether, or severely limit their interest and participation after they become married and begin to rear families. This turnover of membership is a debilitating factor from the standpoint of maintaining a cohesive, active membership base as a political resource with which to reward friends and punish enemies.

---

[7] Pettit, *op. cit.*, chapters II and VI.

The purpose of this article has been to demonstrate that schools at all levels are important instruments through which the social and economic values of a political system are transmitted, and to show that the schools also are identifiable political entities capable of wielding resources of their own. An attempt has been made to focus on some of the more outstanding educational issues to show that no matter how exercised school authorities may become over the charge, education is very much a part of politics.